

# Automating Equational Proofs in Dirac Notation

YINGTE XU, MPI-SP, Germany and Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

GILLES BARTHE\*, MPI-SP, Germany and IMDEA Software Institute, Spain

LI ZHOU\*, Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

Dirac notation is widely used in quantum physics and quantum programming languages to define, compute and reason about quantum states. This paper considers Dirac notation from the perspective of automated reasoning. We prove two main results: first, the first-order theory of Dirac notation is decidable, by a reduction to the theory of real closed fields and Tarski's theorem. Then, we prove that validity of equations can be decided efficiently, using term-rewriting techniques. We implement our equivalence checking algorithm in Mathematica, and showcase its efficiency across more than 100 examples from the literature.

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → **Special-purpose algebraic systems**; • **Theory of computation** → **Rewrite systems**; *Quantum computation theory*.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Dirac notation, term rewriting, automated verification

## ACM Reference Format:

Yingte Xu, Gilles Barthe, and Li Zhou. 2025. Automating Equational Proofs in Dirac Notation. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 9, POPL, Article 42 (January 2025), 61 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3704878>

## 1 Introduction

Dirac notation [23], also known as bra-ket notation, is widely used by quantum physicists for representing quantum states and operations on quantum states. For instance, a quantum bit is conveniently denoted as a linear combination  $\alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle$ , where  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$  are complex numbers such that  $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ , where  $|\cdot|$  denotes the real-valued norm of a complex number. This notation is particularly advantageous for conducting complex calculations about quantum states. Dirac notation is also widely used in quantum programming languages [9, 33, 48, 57, 72, 75] to describe the semantics of programming languages and to write assertions, in particular pre- and post-conditions, about quantum programs. An important consequence is that program verification of quantum programs involves extensive manipulation of Dirac expressions, similar to the way program verification of classical programs involves extensive manipulation of boolean formulae.

However, a significant distinction between classical and quantum program verification is that in the quantum setting, there is limited support for automating these manipulations. Consequently, proofs of quantum programs are generally dominated by manual manipulation of Dirac notations. The lack of support for reasoning about Dirac notation has a negative impact on the verification of quantum programs: simple examples may be unnecessarily tedious to verify and larger examples

\*Corresponding author: Gilles Barthe, Li Zhou

Authors' Contact Information: Yingte Xu, [yingte.xu@mpi-sp.org](mailto:yingte.xu@mpi-sp.org), [lucianoxu@foxmail.com](mailto:lucianoxu@foxmail.com), MPI-SP, Germany and Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China; Gilles Barthe, [gilles.barthe@mpi-sp.org](mailto:gilles.barthe@mpi-sp.org), MPI-SP, Germany and IMDEA Software Institute, Spain; Li Zhou, [zhouli@ios.ac.cn](mailto:zhouli@ios.ac.cn), [zhou31416@gmail.com](mailto:zhou31416@gmail.com), Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM 2475-1421/2025/1-ART42  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3704878>

can be extremely challenging to verify. To illustrate this phenomenon, Figure 1 shows an excerpt of the proof in CoqQ [75] of the Harrow-Hassidim-Lloyd (HHL) algorithm [34] for solving systems of linear equations. In this example, assertions are written using Dirac notation, and each application of the unitary rule (to handle assignments) is interleaved with rewriting of the assertion using equational reasoning on Dirac assertions. The extensive use of non-trivial equational reasoning in program verification is a main obstacle towards scalable verification in quantum programs.

On the other hand, quantum physics has a very strong mathematical foundation. Dirac notation is grounded in linear algebra and has a direct interpretation in Hilbert spaces. There has been a long line of work revisiting and developing these foundations from a theoretical computer science perspective, ranging from categorical semantics and models of computations to graphical languages and tools. However, these two lines of work have remained rather separate so far. In particular, categorical semantics does not target concrete language syntaxes and reasonings, while the ZX-calculus [69] relies on a restricted form of circuit model. We are not aware of any prior systematic exploration that treats general Dirac notation as an algebraic structure and designs the explicit automated deduction for equational reasonings.

The main objective of the paper is to study Dirac notation from the perspective of automated reasoning. Specifically, we consider the following questions:

- What is decidable about Dirac notation?
- Can some classes of problems be solved efficiently in practice?
- What are the potential benefits for deductive verification of quantum programs?

*Contributions.* This paper undertakes a systematic study of automated deduction for Dirac notation. The technical basis for our study is a presentation of core Dirac notation as a (many-sorted) first-order theory DN that includes common objects and operators used in quantum physics, including bras, kets, operators, and different forms of composition and products. As such, it provides a convenient basis to consider decision problems.

Our first technical contribution is a proof that the first-order theory of Dirac notation is decidable. The proof exploits the fact that every finite-dimensional complex Hilbert space is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , where  $n$  is the dimension of the space in which every formula of DN is reduced to a logically equivalent formula in the first-order theory of complex numbers. The latter is decidable by a straightforward extension of Tarski's theorem, thus DN is decidable. Unfortunately, the result is mostly of theoretical interest, in particular, due to the complexity of quantifier elimination—inherited from the reals and amplified by the decomposition of Hilbert spaces into Cartesian products.

Our second contribution is a term-rewriting system for DN expressions. Specifically, we define a term-rewriting system modulo commutativity (C) and associativity and commutativity (AC), and we prove, with the help of CiME2 [20] and AProVE [31], two state-of-the-art tools for confluence and termination proofs respectively, that the term-rewriting system satisfies local confluence (modulo axioms) and termination. It follows that the equality of expressions can be proved by computing normal forms and checking the equality of their normal forms. As a contribution of independent interest, we also use the Coq proof assistant to give a mechanized proof of soundness for all the rewriting rules with respect to a formalization of finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces from [75]. As a further step, we extend our language with finitely indexed sums, a.k.a., big sums, which are used pervasively in Dirac notation. For example, the entangled state  $\sum_{i \in M} |i, i\rangle$  is represented by the superposition (i.e., vector sum) of basis states. We also define a heuristic procedure to prove the equality of extended expressions.

We complement our technical contributions with three practical contributions. First, we implement a Mathematica package, called DiracDec, that exploits the ideas developed in the paper in a

$$\begin{aligned}
& \{ |0\rangle_p |0\rangle_q |0\rangle_r \} \\
& \bullet \text{ q := } U_b[q]; \text{ (Ax.UTF')} \\
& \{ |0\rangle_p (U_b[q] |0\rangle_q) |0\rangle_r \} \Leftrightarrow \{ |0\rangle_p |b\rangle_q |0\rangle_r \} \\
& \bullet \text{ p := } H_n[p]; \text{ (Ax.UTF')} \\
& \{ (H_n[p] |0\rangle_p) |b\rangle_q |0\rangle_r \} \Leftrightarrow \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \sum_{\tau: [n+1]} |\tau\rangle_p |b\rangle_q |0\rangle_r \right\} \\
& \bullet [p, q] := U_f[p, q]; \text{ (Ax.UTF')} \\
& \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \sum_{\tau} (U_f[p, q] |\tau\rangle_p |b\rangle_q) |0\rangle_r \right\} \Leftrightarrow \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \sum_j \left( \sum_{\tau} \beta_j e^{i\tau\lambda_j t_0 / (n+1)} |\tau\rangle_p \right) |u_j\rangle_q |0\rangle_r \right\} \\
& \bullet \text{ p := IQFT}[p]; \text{ (Ax.UTF')} \\
& \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \sum_j (\text{IQFT}[p] \sum_{\tau} \beta_j e^{i\tau\lambda_j t_0 / (n+1)} |\tau\rangle_p) |u_j\rangle_q |0\rangle_r \right\} \Leftrightarrow \{ \sum_j \beta_j |\delta_j\rangle_p |u_j\rangle_q |0\rangle_r \} \\
& \bullet [p, r] := U_c[p, r]; \text{ (Ax.UTF')} \\
& \{ \sum_j \beta_j |u_j\rangle_q (U_c[p, r] |\delta_j\rangle_p) |0\rangle_r \} \Leftrightarrow \{ \sum_j \beta_j |\delta_j\rangle_p |u_j\rangle_q |v_j\rangle_r \} \\
& \bullet \text{ p := QFT}[p]; \text{ (Ax.UTF')} \\
& \{ \sum_j \beta_j (\text{QFT}[p] |\delta_j\rangle_p) |u_j\rangle_q |v_j\rangle_r \} \Leftrightarrow \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \sum_{j, \tau} \beta_j e^{i2\pi\delta_j\tau/T} |\tau\rangle_p |u_j\rangle_q |v_j\rangle_r \right\} \\
& \bullet [p, q] := U_f^\dagger[p, q]; \text{ (Ax.UTF')} \\
& \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \sum_{j, \tau} \beta_j e^{i2\pi\delta_j\tau/T} (U_f^{-1}[p, q] |\tau\rangle_p) |u_j\rangle_q |v_j\rangle_r \right\} \Leftrightarrow \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \sum_{\tau} |\tau\rangle_p \sum_j \beta_j |u_j\rangle_q |v_j\rangle_r \right\} \\
& \bullet \text{ p := } H_n^\dagger[p]; \text{ (Ax.UTF')} \\
& \left\{ (H_n^\dagger[p] \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \sum_{\tau} |\tau\rangle_p) \sum_j \beta_j |u_j\rangle_q |v_j\rangle_r \right\} \Leftrightarrow \{ |0\rangle_p \sum_j \beta_j |u_j\rangle_q |v_j\rangle_r \}
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 1. Proof snippet of HHL algorithm in Quantum Hoare Logic. The snippet is taken from [75]. Every application of structural rule (e.g., unitary) is interleaved with equational reasoning on Dirac notation. This example illustrates the prominence of equational reasoning.

richer setting with trigonometric and exponential functions, native big sums, and dynamic typing. Second, we evaluate our approach using more than 200 examples from the CoqQ project [75], which constitutes the main motivation for our work. For completeness, we also carry a lightweight evaluation of DiracDec on other classes of examples from the literature on quantum circuits. As expected, our tool performs less efficiently than existing tools that are specifically targeted to this class of examples. Third, we formally verify the soundness of our rewriting rules in CoqQ.

*Artefacts.* We provide as complementary material the Mathematica tool implementation DiracDec, the formalization of the soundness of the rewriting rules in CoqQ, the confluence proof in CiME2 and the termination proof in AProVE, and the set of examples. All will be made publicly available.

## 2 Introduction to Dirac Notation

This section provides a gentle introduction to Dirac notation. In order to be as self-contained as possible, we base our explanations on matrices. For more detailed accounts, we refer the reader to classic textbooks [54].

It is very common to represent quantum states, or kets (denoted by  $|\cdot\rangle$ ), as complex column vectors, i.e., as column vectors whose entries are complex numbers. For example, it is common

to represent an arbitrary qubit as  $|\psi\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}$ . Using this representation, it is easy to see that every quantum bit is a superposition of classical bits. Specifically, we can introduce the representations of the classical bits 0 and 1 as  $|0\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$  and  $|1\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ . Using basic properties of addition on matrices and multiplication by scalars, one can prove that  $|\psi\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle$ , i.e., every qubit is a superposition of classical bits.

The matrix representation of quantum states can also be used to represent covectors, also known as bras. It is very common to represent bras (denoted by  $\langle \cdot |$ ) as row vectors. The covector of a ket  $|v\rangle$  is a bra  $\langle v|$  such that  $\langle v| = |v\rangle^\dagger$ , where  $\dagger$  represents the conjugate transpose of a matrix. For example,  $\langle 0| = [1 \ 0]$ ,  $\langle 1| = [0 \ 1]$ .

Furthermore, bras and kets can be combined using matrix operations. One can, for instance, define the inner and outer product of two quantum states  $|u\rangle$  and  $|v\rangle$  as:

$$\langle u|v\rangle \triangleq \langle u| \cdot |v\rangle = [u_1^* \ \cdots \ u_n^*] \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ \vdots \\ v_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad |u\rangle\langle v| \triangleq |u\rangle \cdot \langle v| = \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ \vdots \\ u_n \end{bmatrix} [v_1^* \ \cdots \ v_n^*].$$

Inner product and outer product are the constructions that relate (co)states to scalars and operators. They are frequently used in applications, for example, decomposition state  $|u\rangle$  as a linear combination of basis  $\{|v_i\rangle\}$  is represented as  $|u\rangle = \sum_i \langle v_i|u_i\rangle |v_i\rangle$ , and any operators can be decomposed as  $A = \sum_{ij} c_{ij} |u_i\rangle\langle v_j|$  for arbitrary basis  $\{|u_i\rangle\}$  and  $\{|v_i\rangle\}$ .

Unitary operators (describing the evolution of a closed quantum system), measurement operators (describing the quantum measurement), and Kraus operators (describing the evolution of an open system) are all represented by matrices, and the application to a quantum state is described by matrix multiplication. For example, Pauli X gate, or bit-flip gate, is a unitary operator and can be represented as  $X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ . When applied to  $|0\rangle$ , the resulting state is  $X|0\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = |1\rangle$ .

When many-body quantum systems are considered, states in and operators on the composite systems are described by tensor products (Kronecker products) together with possible linear combinations. For example, for a two-qubit system with  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  on the first and second qubit, the whole system is described by:

$$|0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Finally, the matrix representation is convenient for building complex quantum states from smaller constituents. For example, the maximally entangled state of the two-qubit system, known as the Bell state, is:

$$|\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle + |1\rangle \otimes |1\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

The matrix representation is intuitive and is widely used to compute quantum states. However, working directly with the concrete matrix representation has a number of shortcomings: 1. complexity problem: expressing and calculating matrices require time and space scaled by the Hilbert space dimension, which grows exponentially with the number of subsystems; 2. for composite systems, structural information is lost if a state or operator is represented in a matrix form, e.g., for Equation (1), the calculation from left to right is trivial while the decomposition from right to left is relatively less obvious; 3. matrix representation is limited to finite-dimensional Hilbert space and cannot explore the properties of infinite-dimensional cases.

<pre> theorem (in quantum_machine) no_cloning:   assumes [simp]: "dim_vec v = 2^n" and [simp]: "dim_vec w = 2^n" and     cloning1: "\\$. U * (  v\rangle \otimes  s\rangle) =  v\rangle \otimes  v\rangle" and     cloning2: "\\$. U * (  w\rangle \otimes  s\rangle) =  w\rangle \otimes  w\rangle" and     "\langle v v\rangle = 1" and "\langle w w\rangle = 1"   shows "v = w \vee \langle v w\rangle = 0" </pre>	$\models_{\mu}^{\#} \{  t\rangle_x \} \text{rev\_circuit} \{  t\rangle_{\text{rev}(x)} \} \quad \models_{\mu}^{\#} \{  t\rangle_{\text{rev}(x)} \} \text{rev\_circuit} \{  t\rangle_x \}$ $\models_{\mu}^{\#} \{  b\rangle_y \} \text{QFT\_cir} \{  QFTbv\rangle_y \} \quad \text{where }  QFTbv\rangle_y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{t \in \{0,1\}^n} e^{2\pi i f(t)/2^n}  t\rangle$ $\forall a < n, \models_{\mu}^{\#} \{  c(a)\phi\rangle_y \} \text{QPE} \{  a\rangle_x   \phi \rangle_y \} \quad \text{with } c(a) \triangleq \sum_{j < n} e^{2\pi i (a(n-j)) / n}$
---	---

Fig. 2. Screenshot from [14] (left) and [75] (right). The left one is the formalization of the no-cloning theorem in Isabelle, while the right one contains Hoare triples for the correctness of programs in Coq.

These shortcomings are overcome by Dirac notation [23], which provides an expressive syntax for quantum states and operators. The syntax of Dirac critically exploits the algebraic structure of quantum states and linear operators as Hilbert spaces. Formally, let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a (finite or infinite) Hilbert space with inner product denoted by  $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \in \mathbb{C}$  for any  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{H}$ , and we write  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}')$  for the set of linear operators mapping from  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\mathcal{H}'$  (further abbreviated to  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \triangleq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H})$  for endomorphisms). Dirac notation consists of and is interpreted as:

- Ket  $|u\rangle$  denotes  $\mathbf{u}$  is a state in  $\mathcal{H}$ ;
- Bra  $\langle u|$  is a linear mapping  $\langle u| : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  defined by  $\langle u| \triangleq \mathbf{v} \mapsto \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ . Such linear maps form a dual Hilbert space denoted by  $\mathcal{H}^*$  (which is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{H}$ );
- Inner product  $\langle u|v\rangle \triangleq \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \in \mathbb{C}$ ;
- Outer product  $|u\rangle\langle v| : |w\rangle \mapsto \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle |u\rangle$  is a linear map from  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\mathcal{H}'$  if  $|u\rangle \in \mathcal{H}'$  and  $|v\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ ;
- Tensor product  $|u\rangle \otimes |v\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$  (or simply  $|u\rangle|v\rangle$ ),  $\langle u| \otimes \langle v| \in \mathcal{H}_1^* \otimes \mathcal{H}_2^*$  (or simply  $\langle u|\langle v|$ ), or  $A_1 \otimes A_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}'_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}'_2)$  such that: 1. tensor is a bilinear map; 2. consistency on inner product:  $\langle \phi_1 | \phi_2 \rangle = \langle u_1 | u_2 \rangle \times \langle v_1 | v_2 \rangle$  where  $|\phi_1\rangle = |u_1\rangle \otimes |v_1\rangle$  and  $|\phi_2\rangle = |u_2\rangle \otimes |v_2\rangle$ ; 3.  $(A \otimes B)(|u\rangle \otimes |v\rangle) = (A|u\rangle) \otimes (B|v\rangle)$ .

One major benefit of Dirac notation is that quantum states are concisely described by symbolic expressions rather than through their matrix representation. Thus, all equational reasoning about quantum states can be done completely symbolically and, in particular, independently of the dimension of the underlying Hilbert space.

Thanks to its benefits, Dirac notation is widely adopted in quantum physics and in the foundations of quantum programming languages, as sketched below.

*Applications of Dirac notation.* Dirac notation plays an essential role in quantum physics and in the semantics and verification of quantum programming languages, as elaborated below.

- (1) *Formalization of quantum computing.* Dirac notation was originally designed to describe quantum mechanics [23]. It can be used to describe quantum states as well as operations and measurements over quantum states. For example, the unitary evolution  $U$  transforms an input state  $|u\rangle$  to  $U|u\rangle$ ; quantum measurement is a set of linear operators  $\{M_i\}$  such that, performing on normalized state  $|u\rangle$ , we have probability  $\langle u|M_i^\dagger M_i|u\rangle$  to obtain classical result  $i$  with post-measurement state  $\frac{M_i|u\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle u|M_i^\dagger M_i|u\rangle}}$ . The formalization of quantum computing and quantum information has gained attention in recent years [14, 28]. For example, the project [13] titled "Isabelle Marries Dirac" formalizes the fundamental concepts of quantum mechanics within Isabelle/HOL and introduces Dirac notation into the library to facilitate expressions. Figure 2 (left) shows how they formalize the no-cloning theorem using Dirac notation [14].
- (2) *Quantum program verification.* Starting from [27], several works (e.g., [67, 71, 73, 76], see Section 11 for more details) utilize observables or projection operators (both are subclasses of linear operators) as assertions, establishing Hoare-style proof systems for reasoning about quantum programs. The assertion languages and their deduction are directly expressed

by Dirac notation (see correctness formulas in Figure 2 (right) from CoqQ [75], a verified quantum program verifier). Generally, quantum programming languages include syntax corresponding to physical operations, which leads to the wide application of Dirac notation in each step. It includes defining semantics, proving general properties of programs and states via semantics, showing the soundness and completeness of Hoare-style proof systems, deriving and simplifying quantum predicates, etc.

### 3 Motivating Example

Entanglement is one of the most important phenomena that distinguishes quantum systems from classical systems. In quantum computing, entangled states serve as a crucial computational resource, particularly for distributed systems and communication protocols, and they also play a key role in quantum cryptography. In physics (and even in realms of philosophy), entangled states challenge our conventional understanding of correlation and causality through the quantum non-locality, e.g., quantum effect can propagate faster than light (although this does not imply classical information can be transferred faster than light)<sup>1</sup>. This phenomenon might be demonstrated by a simple example: suppose Alice and Bob share the maximally entangled states  $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{i \in V} |i\rangle |i\rangle$ . The following two actions are equivalent: 1. Alice applies an arbitrary operator  $M$  to her state; 2. Bob applies operator  $M^T$  (the transpose of  $M$ ) to his states, which can be described by the equation  $(M \otimes I)|\Phi\rangle = (I \otimes M^T)|\Phi\rangle$ . This equation might be interpreted intuitively as no matter who performs the operation and how far they are separated, the global state changes simultaneously on both sides.

*Example 3.1 (c.f. [75]).* Let  $|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{i \in V} |i\rangle |i\rangle$  be the maximally entangled state on Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_V \otimes \mathcal{H}_V$ . Then for all operators  $M \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_V)$ ,

$$(M \otimes I)|\Phi\rangle = (I \otimes M^T)|\Phi\rangle.$$

Here is a step-wise proof of how humans derive the equations, which proceeds by rewriting both sides into the same form according to the laws of linear algebra. The LHS is :

$$\begin{aligned} (LHS) \quad (M \otimes I)|\Phi\rangle &= (M \otimes I) \left( \sum_{i \in V} |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle \right) && \{ \text{unfold } |\Phi\rangle \text{ definition} \} \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{i \in V} (M \otimes I)(|i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle) && \{ \text{push terms into the sum} \} \quad (3)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in V} (M|i\rangle) \otimes |i\rangle && \{ \text{rearrange tensor and composition} \} \quad (4)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in V} \left( \sum_{j \in V} |j\rangle \langle j| \right) (M|i\rangle) \otimes |i\rangle && \{ \text{insert the identity } I = \sum_{j \in V} |j\rangle \langle j| \} \quad (5)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in V} \langle j|M|i\rangle |j\rangle \otimes |i\rangle && \{ \text{rearrange tensor and composition} \} \quad (6)$$

<sup>1</sup>This history of physics is particularly fascinating. In 1935, physicists Albert Einstein, Boris Podolsky, and Nathan Rosen introduced a paradox concerning entangled states, suggesting that quantum mechanics is incomplete, i.e., it cannot be interpreted by local hidden variable models. In 1964, John Bell formulated the Bell inequality, which provides a way to experimentally test the existence of non-locality. To date, all experiments have aligned with the predictions of quantum mechanics, confirming that non-locality does indeed exist.

We further proceed on RHS:

$$(RHS) \quad (I \otimes M^T) |\Phi\rangle \\ = \left( I \otimes \left( \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in V} \langle i | M | j \rangle |j\rangle \langle i| \right) \right) \sum_{k \in V} |k\rangle \otimes |k\rangle \quad \{ \text{unfold } M^T \text{ and } |\Phi\rangle \text{ definitions} \} \quad (7)$$

$$= \sum_{k \in V} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in V} \langle i | M | j \rangle (I \cdot |k\rangle) \otimes (|j\rangle \langle i|k\rangle) \quad \{ \text{push into the sum, rearrange} \} \quad (8)$$

$$= \sum_{k \in V} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in V} \delta_{i,k} \langle i | M | j \rangle (|k\rangle \otimes |j\rangle) \quad \{ \text{calculating compositions} \} \quad (9)$$

$$= \sum_{k \in V} \sum_{j \in V} \langle k | M | j \rangle |k\rangle \otimes |j\rangle \quad \{ \text{eliminate } \sum_{i \in V} \delta_{i,k} \} \quad (10)$$

Then we check that normal forms Equation (8) and Equation (10) are equivalent under renaming of sum indices and the swapping of sums.

Many similar properties of entangled states might be proved in the same style. However, this style of equational reasoning may quickly become challenging. In particular, equational proofs become significantly longer and hence more error-prone when more complex (bi-partite or even multi-partite) quantum systems are considered. Our work demonstrates that such forms of equational reasoning can be fully automated and carried out efficiently within existing tools for symbolic computation.

## 4 Background

We work in the setting of (typed) equational and first-order logics.

*Theories.* A signature consists of a set  $\mathcal{F}$  of function symbols with a map  $|\cdot|$  that maps every function symbol to an arity of the form  $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \rightarrow \tau$ , where  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \tau$  range over a (possibly inductively defined) set  $\mathcal{T}$  of types.

Given an indexed set  $\mathbf{X} = (X_\sigma)_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}}$  of variables, we can defined set  $T_\Sigma(\mathbf{X})$  of well-typed terms. An equation (or atomic formula) is a compound of the form  $e \doteq e'$ , where  $e$  and  $e'$  are well-typed terms—we implicitly assume that the expressions are built from a fixed set  $\mathbf{X} = (X_\sigma)_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}}$  of variables, and that  $e$  and  $e'$  have the same type  $\sigma$ . A first-order formula is built from equations using boolean connectives and (typed) quantifiers.

*Equational and first-order reasoning.* Let  $\Sigma$  be a signature and a set  $E$  of equations.

*Definition 4.1 (Derivable equation and formula).*

- An equation  $e \doteq e'$  is derivable from  $E$ , written  $E \vdash e \doteq e'$ , if it can be derived using the rules from Figure 3.
- A formula  $\phi$  is derivable from  $E$ , written,  $E \vdash e \doteq e'$ , if it can be derived using the rules from Figure 3 and the rules of first-order logic.

In this paper we are concerned with the existence of decision algorithms for equations and formulae.

### 4.1 Deciding Equalities

A classic approach to decide if an equation is derivable is by defining a well-behaved term-rewriting system (TRS). Informally, the main difference between an equational theory and a term-rewriting system is that the latter is made of oriented equations, with the additional clause that every variable in the right-hand side appears also in the left-hand side. Given a set of oriented equations  $R$ ,  $e$



$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{s \doteq t \in E}{E \vdash s \doteq t} \quad \frac{}{E \vdash t \doteq t} \quad \frac{E \vdash s \doteq t}{E \vdash t \doteq s} \quad \frac{E \vdash s \doteq t \quad E \vdash t \doteq u}{E \vdash s \doteq u} \\
\\
\frac{E \vdash s \doteq t}{E \vdash v(s) \doteq v(t)} \quad \frac{E \vdash s_1 \doteq t_1 \quad \cdots \quad E \vdash s_n \doteq t_n}{E \vdash f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \doteq f(t_1, \dots, t_n)}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 3. The inference rules of equational logic.  $v(s)$  and  $v(t)$  represent the result after substitution  $v$ .  $f$  is an arbitrary symbol in the signature.

rewrites to  $e'$ , written  $e \rightarrow_R e'$ , if  $R \vdash e \doteq e'$  can be derived using the rules of reflexivity and congruence arbitrarily often, and the rule of instantiation exactly once. The reflexive-transitive (resp. reflexive-symmetric-transitive) closure of  $\rightarrow_R$  is denoted  $\rightarrow_R^*$  (resp.  $=_R$ ).

We provide a brief recap of the properties of term-rewriting systems and the relations between the properties. A term-rewriting system is *terminating*, if there are no infinite rewriting paths. The terms that cannot be rewritten anymore are called *normal forms*. Another desired property is *confluence*, which intuitively says that the reachable terms during (possibly infinite) rewritings should not depend on the order of applying the rules. Formally, it means for all terms  $u, s, t$  such that  $u \rightarrow_R^* s$  and  $u \rightarrow_R^* t$ , there exists  $v$  satisfying  $s \rightarrow_R^* v$  and  $t \rightarrow_R^* v$ . There is a weaker concept called *local confluence*, stating that rewritings diverging by one step will finally converge, i.e.,  $\forall u s t, (u \rightarrow_R s \wedge u \rightarrow_R t) \rightarrow (\exists v, s \rightarrow_R^* v \wedge t \rightarrow_R^* v)$ . For terminating term-rewriting systems, Newman's Lemma [53] guarantees that local confluence implies confluence. In this case, there will be a unique normal form for every term.

## 4.2 A Primer on AC Rewriting

Some equivalence in our theory cannot be decided by simple term-rewriting. For example, transforming scalar commutativity  $a + b = b + a$  into  $a + b \triangleright b + a$  will result in a non-terminating term-rewriting system. Therefore, we separate the problematic equations into the set  $E$  and decide them using specialized techniques. Afterwards, we design the TRS for the remaining axioms  $R$  and perform it on the equivalence classes defined by  $E$ . This approach is known as the term-rewriting modulo equational theories. The AC rewriting here is a special case where  $E$  consists of associative and/or commutative theories of the symbols.

To decide whether two terms  $a$  and  $b$  are equivalent in  $R \cup E$ , we can simply rewrite them into the  $R$ -normal forms and check whether they are equivalent with respect to  $E$ . The standard technique to decide the AC equivalence is to use auxiliary symbols with variable arities, then flatten and sort the successive nodes of the same AC symbol. For example, the two terms  $(a + b) + c$  and  $b + (a + c)$  will be transformed into  $+(a, b, c)$ , whose syntactical equivalence implies AC equivalence of the original terms. Rewriting modulo AC also complicates the matching and unification procedure, which are essential components for rule applications and the local confluence proof. For example, the rule  $\alpha + 0 \triangleright \alpha$  matches the term  $a + (b + 0)$  at subterm  $b + 0$ , while it can also match the term  $(a + b) + 0$ , which is AC equivalent to the original term.

## 4.3 Deciding Formulae

A classic approach to decide if a formula is derivable is quantifier elimination. Informally, quantifier elimination computes for every formula  $\phi$  a provably equivalent quantifier-free formula  $\psi$ , so that derivability of  $\phi$  can be reduced to validity of a boolean combination of atomic formulae. In this case, any algorithm for deciding equalities can be lifted to an algorithm to decide formulae.



Naturally, the complexity of the decision procedure for formulae may be significantly higher than the complexity of the decision procedure for equations, when quantifier elimination is very costly.

A celebrated result by Tarski [65] establishes that the theory of real closed fields has quantifier elimination and is decidable. Later, Collins [19] proposed a new algorithm for quantifier elimination. This algorithm, coined CAD or cylindrical algebraic decomposition, is more performant than the original procedure by Tarski, but remains doubly exponential, so that many formulae in the theory of real closed fields remain beyond the reach of state-of-the-art verification tools.

There is a long line of research that aims to extend Tarski's result to richer settings. The well-known Tarski's high school algebra problem asks whether the theory of real-closed fields extended with the exponential function is decidable. [52] prove that the theory is decidable assuming the Schanuel's conjecture, a fundamental conjecture in transcendental number theory.

Our work builds on another, less pursued, line of research that extends Tarski's result to algebraic structures such as vector and Hilbert spaces. [32] shows that the first-order theory of vector spaces is decidable. His proof is based on tools from stability theory. [63] show that the first-order theory of finite-dimensional real vector spaces is decidable. Their proof is based on an algorithm that transforms every formula in the theory into a logically equivalent formula in the first-order theory of reals. Its decidability follows from Tarski's theorem.

## 5 The Basic Theory of Dirac Notation

This section introduces the basic theory DN of Dirac notation. We start by defining the expression language.

### 5.1 Expressions

Our expression language is typed. We define the types below.

*Definition 5.1 (Types).* Types are defined inductively by the following grammar:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \text{(classical types)} & \sigma ::= \alpha \mid \sigma \times \sigma, \\
 \text{(quantum types)} & T ::= \mathcal{K}(\sigma) \mid \mathcal{B}(\sigma) \mid \mathcal{O}(\sigma, \sigma), \\
 \text{(types)} & U ::= \mathcal{S} \mid \sigma \mid T.
 \end{array}$$

We use  $\alpha$  for atomic type constants and Greek letters like  $\sigma, \tau, \rho$  to represent the classical types.

Types are built from classical types. Classical types are either atomic classical types or Cartesian products of classical types. Each atomic classical type  $\alpha$  comes with a finite set of inhabitants  $t_1, \dots, t_n$ . Given classical type  $\sigma$ , we define the type  $\mathcal{K}(\sigma)$  of kets and the type  $\mathcal{B}(\sigma)$  of bras, that will be interpreted as the Hilbert space spanned by elements of  $\sigma$  and the dual of  $\mathcal{K}(\sigma)$ , respectively. Moreover, given two classical types  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$ , we define the types  $\mathcal{O}(\sigma, \tau)$  of linear operators from the Hilbert space spanned by  $\tau$  to the Hilbert space spanned by  $\sigma$ . Finally, we consider a type  $\mathcal{S}$  of scalars. Note that our type system does not explicitly include a constructor  $\otimes$  for tensor products. Instead, tensor products are built through Cartesian products on classical types. For example, the tensor product of two types  $\mathcal{K}(\sigma)$  and  $\mathcal{K}(\tau)$  is represented as  $\mathcal{K}(\sigma \times \tau)$ .

Next, we define expressions for bras, kets, operators, and scalars.

*Definition 5.2 (Expressions).* Expressions are defined inductively by the following grammar:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{basis}) \quad & t ::= x \mid b \mid (t, t), \\
(\text{scalar}) \quad & a ::= x \mid 0 \mid 1 \mid a + a \mid a \times a \mid a^* \mid \delta_{t,t} \mid B \cdot K, \\
(\text{ket}) \quad & K ::= x \mid \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma) \mid |t\rangle \mid B^\dagger \mid S.K \mid K + K \mid O \cdot K \mid K \otimes K, \\
(\text{bra}) \quad & B ::= x \mid \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{B}}(\sigma) \mid \langle t| \mid K^\dagger \mid S.B \mid B + B \mid B \cdot O \mid B \otimes B, \\
(\text{operator}) \quad & O ::= x \mid \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) \mid \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma) \mid K \cdot B \mid O^\dagger \mid S.O \mid O + O \mid O \cdot O \mid O \otimes O.
\end{aligned}$$

We use  $x$  for term variables. Here,  $b$  represents constant atomic bases. We use lowercase letters like  $s, t$  to represent the classical terms as bases, and  $a, b, c$  to represent scalars. We use letters  $K, B, O$  and their variants to represent terms from the ket, bra and operator sorts, respectively.

Note that our expression language freely uses symbol overloading. However, overloading is easily resolved, as the different syntactic categories are mutually exclusive.

*Basis.* Basis terms are constants, variables, or products of basis terms.

*Scalar.* Scalar terms are variables, constants 0 and 1, addition, multiplication, conjugate, the Kronecker delta function  $\delta_{t_1, t_2}$  with  $t_1, t_2$  being basis terms, and the inner product  $B \cdot K$  with  $B$  a bra and  $K$  a ket.

*Kets and Bras.* Ket terms are built from variables, constants  $\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}$ , and kets  $|t\rangle$  where  $t$  is a basis term, using addition, multiplication by a scalar, conjugate of a bra, operator application  $O \cdot K$  with  $O$  an operator term, and tensor product of two kets.

Bra terms are similar to Ket terms, except the conjugate of a ket and the operator application  $B \cdot O$  where operator term  $O$  appears on the right.

*Operators.* Operator terms consist of variables, constant  $\mathbf{0}_O$  and  $\mathbf{1}_O$  indexed by classical types, using adjoint  $O^\dagger$ , addition, multiplication by a scalar, composition, tensor product, and outer product  $K \cdot B$  with  $K$  a ket and  $B$  a bra.

*Discussion.* We only consider adjoint  $X^\dagger$  rather than conjugate  $X^*$  and transpose  $X^T$  in the core language. This is because the transpose can be constructed after we introduce the big operator sum in the following sections. Then, conjugate can be constructed from the previous two.

## 5.2 Typing

Next, we define the type system for expressions. Typing judgments are of the form  $\Gamma \vdash e : U$ , where  $e$  is an expression,  $U$  is a type, and  $\Gamma$  is a context, i.e., a finite set of typing declarations  $y : U$ , such that every variable is declared at most once. Typing judgments are implicitly parametrized by a map that assigns types to all constants.

*Definition 5.3.* A typing judgement  $\Gamma \vdash e : U$  is valid if it can be derived using the typing rules in Figure 4.

The (CONTEXT) rule states that types of variables come from the context. The rest of the rules define the typing of each symbol. Rules from (KET), (BRA) and (OPERATOR) follow the requirements in their interpretations in linear algebra. For example, the typing rule for inner product  $B \cdot K$  claims that  $B$  and  $K$  should be bra and ket in the same type of space, and the rules for additions require that only terms of the identical type can be summed up. The typing rule for three tensor products follows the isomorphism of product spaces. Notice that  $O(\sigma, \tau)$  represents operators with domain  $\tau$  and codomain  $\sigma$ , which is intuitively consistent with the order of bra-ket notation. The adjoint

$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{(CONTEXT)} \quad \frac{x : \sigma \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : \sigma} \\
\text{(BASIS)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash t : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash (s, t) : \tau \times \sigma} \\
\text{(SCALAR)} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash 0 : \mathcal{S}} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash 1 : \mathcal{S}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash a : \mathcal{S} \quad \Gamma \vdash b : \mathcal{S}}{\Gamma \vdash a + b : \mathcal{S}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash a : \mathcal{S} \quad \Gamma \vdash b : \mathcal{S}}{\Gamma \vdash a \times b : \mathcal{S}} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash a : \mathcal{S}}{\Gamma \vdash a^* : \mathcal{S}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : \sigma \quad \Gamma \vdash t : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \delta_{s,t} : \mathcal{S}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash B \cdot K : \mathcal{S}} \\
\text{(KET)} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}(\tau)} : \mathcal{K}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash |t\rangle : \mathcal{K}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash K^\dagger : \mathcal{B}(\tau)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash a : \mathcal{S} \quad \Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash a.K : \mathcal{K}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash K_1 : \mathcal{K}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash K_2 : \mathcal{K}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash K_1 + K_2 : \mathcal{K}(\tau)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash O : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho) \quad \Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\rho)}{\Gamma \vdash O \cdot K : \mathcal{K}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash K_1 : \mathcal{K}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash K_2 : \mathcal{K}(\rho)}{\Gamma \vdash K_1 \otimes K_2 : \mathcal{K}(\tau \times \rho)} \\
\text{(BRA)} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{B}(\tau)} : \mathcal{B}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \langle t| : \mathcal{B}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash B^\dagger : \mathcal{K}(\tau)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash a : \mathcal{S} \quad \Gamma \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash a.B : \mathcal{B}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash B_1 : \mathcal{B}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash B_2 : \mathcal{B}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash B_1 + B_2 : \mathcal{B}(\tau)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash O : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)}{\Gamma \vdash B \cdot O : \mathcal{B}(\rho)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash B_1 : \mathcal{B}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash B_2 : \mathcal{B}(\rho)}{\Gamma \vdash B_1 \otimes B_2 : \mathcal{B}(\tau \times \rho)} \\
\text{(OPERATOR)} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)} : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}(\tau)} : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \tau)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\rho)}{\Gamma \vdash K \cdot B : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash O : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)}{\Gamma \vdash O^\dagger : \mathcal{O}(\rho, \tau)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash a : \mathcal{S} \quad \Gamma \vdash O : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)}{\Gamma \vdash a.O : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash O_1 : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho) \quad \Gamma \vdash O_2 : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)}{\Gamma \vdash O_1 + O_2 : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash O_1 : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho) \quad \Gamma \vdash O_2 : \mathcal{O}(\rho, \sigma)}{\Gamma \vdash O_1 \cdot O_2 : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \sigma)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash O_1 : \mathcal{O}(\tau_1, \rho_1) \quad \Gamma \vdash O_2 : \mathcal{O}(\tau_2, \rho_2)}{\Gamma \vdash O_1 \otimes O_2 : \mathcal{O}(\tau_1 \times \tau_2, \rho_1 \times \rho_2)}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 4. Typing rules for DN.

of operators can be understood as the conjugate transpose in the matrix view, which swaps the domain and codomain.

### 5.3 Denotational Semantics

Types and expressions of DN can be given denotational semantics using Hilbert spaces.

*Definition 5.4 (Interpretation of types).* The interpretation  $\llbracket U \rrbracket$  of a type is defined inductively as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(Basis types)} & \llbracket \sigma_1 \times \sigma_2 \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket \times \llbracket \sigma_2 \rrbracket, \\
\text{(Basis terms)} & \llbracket (t_1, t_2) \rrbracket \equiv (\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket, \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket), \\
\text{(Dirac types)} & \llbracket \mathcal{S} \rrbracket \equiv \mathbb{C}, \quad \llbracket \mathcal{K}(\sigma) \rrbracket \equiv \mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}, \quad \llbracket \mathcal{B}(\sigma) \rrbracket \equiv \mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}^*, \\
& \llbracket \mathcal{O}(\sigma, \tau) \rrbracket \equiv \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket}, \mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket})
\end{array}$$

We now turn to the interpretation of expressions. As usual, the interpretation is parametrized by a valuation  $v$ , which maps all variables  $x$  to their value  $v(x)$ .

(Basis types)	$\llbracket \sigma_1 \times \sigma_2 \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket \times \llbracket \sigma_2 \rrbracket,$	(Basis terms)	$\llbracket (t_1, t_2) \rrbracket \equiv (\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket, \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket),$
(Dirac types)	$\llbracket \mathcal{S} \rrbracket \equiv \mathbb{C}, \quad \llbracket \mathcal{K}(\sigma) \rrbracket \equiv \mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}, \quad \llbracket \mathcal{B}(\sigma) \rrbracket \equiv \mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}^*,$		
	$\llbracket \mathcal{O}(\sigma, \tau) \rrbracket \equiv \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket}, \mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}),$		
(Scalars)	$\llbracket 0 \rrbracket \equiv 0, \quad \llbracket 1 \rrbracket \equiv 1, \quad \llbracket a + b \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket a \rrbracket + \llbracket b \rrbracket, \quad \llbracket a \times b \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket a \rrbracket \times \llbracket b \rrbracket,$		
	$\llbracket a^* \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket a \rrbracket^*, \quad \llbracket \delta_{s,t} \rrbracket \equiv \begin{cases} 1, & \text{where } \llbracket s \rrbracket = \llbracket t \rrbracket, \\ 0, & \text{where } \llbracket s \rrbracket \neq \llbracket t \rrbracket, \end{cases}$		$\llbracket B \cdot K \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket B \rrbracket \cdot \llbracket K \rrbracket,$
(Constants)	$\llbracket \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma) \rrbracket \equiv \mathbf{0}, \quad \llbracket \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{B}}(\sigma) \rrbracket \equiv \mathbf{0}, \quad \llbracket \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{O}}(\sigma, \tau) \rrbracket \equiv \mathbf{0}, \quad \llbracket \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}}(\sigma) \rrbracket \equiv \mathbf{I},$		
(Basis)	$\llbracket  t\rangle \rrbracket \equiv   \llbracket t \rrbracket \rangle, \quad \llbracket \langle t  \rrbracket \equiv \langle \llbracket t \rrbracket  ,$		
(Shared symbols)	$\llbracket D^\dagger \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket D \rrbracket^\dagger, \quad \llbracket a.D \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket D \rrbracket, \quad \llbracket D_1 + D_2 \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket D_1 \rrbracket + \llbracket D_2 \rrbracket,$		
	$\llbracket D_1 \cdot D_2 \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket D_1 \rrbracket \cdot \llbracket D_2 \rrbracket, \quad \llbracket D_1 \otimes D_2 \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket D_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket D_2 \rrbracket.$		

Fig. 5. Denotational semantics of DN expressions. Symbol  $D$  represents appropriate terms from the ket, bra, or operator sorts. As introduced in Section 2, states in  $\mathcal{H}$  are represented by column vector, co-states in  $\mathcal{H}^*$  by row vector, then all  $\cdot$  above are interpreted as matrix multiplications, while  $\otimes$  as Kronecker products<sup>2</sup>.

*Definition 5.5 (Semantics of expressions).* The interpretation of  $e$  under valuation  $v$ , written as  $\llbracket e \rrbracket_v$ , is defined by the clauses of Figure 5.

*Definition 5.6.* With the assumed context  $\Gamma$  and valuation  $v$ , the denotational semantics of well-typed DN expressions is defined in Figure 5.

The denotational semantics provides an interpretation for the equation  $e_1 = e_2$ : they are semantically equal if  $\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket_v = \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket_v$  holds for all valuations  $v$ , denoted as  $\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket$ .

In the definition, basis types and Dirac types are interpreted into domain sets, while terms are interpreted into set elements. Notice that the interpretation  $\llbracket x \rrbracket_v$  and  $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket_v$  for variables are given by the valuation  $v(x)$  and  $v(\alpha)$ .

For basis types, the product is interpreted as the Cartesian product of component type sets. Correspondingly, the basis pair  $(s, t)$  is explained as an element in the product set.

The semantics for Dirac types are the complex field, Hilbert space, dual space, and linear operations, respectively. The bases of these spaces are determined by the interpretation of their type annotations. The constant symbols  $\mathbf{0}$  are interpreted as the zero row/column vector or the zero matrix, and  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}}$  is interpreted as the identity matrix.  $|t\rangle$  and  $\langle t|$  are explained as the basis vectors. The three sorts, ket, bra and operator, share some symbols like addition, scalar multiplication and tensor product, and their semantics are defined in the same way. For example,  $\llbracket O \cdot K \rrbracket$  is interpreted as the multiplication between matrix  $\llbracket O \rrbracket$  and column vector  $\llbracket K \rrbracket$ , while  $\llbracket K \cdot B \rrbracket$  is interpreted as the multiplication between column vector  $\llbracket K \rrbracket$  and row vector  $\llbracket B \rrbracket$ .

The denotational semantics of DN is sound in the following sense:

**LEMMA 5.7 (SOUNDNESS OF DENOTATIONAL SEMANTICS).** *Let  $v$  be a valuation such that  $v(x) \in \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$  for every  $(x : \sigma) \in \Gamma$ . If  $\Gamma \vdash e : U$  then  $\llbracket e \rrbracket \in \llbracket U \rrbracket$ .*

<sup>2</sup>Alternatively, in abstract linear algebra or functional view,  $\cdot$  is the function application or function composition while  $\otimes$  is the tensor product of states, co-states, or operators.

$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{(AX-SCALAR)} \quad 0 + a = a \quad a + b = b + a \quad (a + b) + c = a + (b + c) \\
\quad 0 \times a = 0 \quad 1 \times a = a \quad a \times b = b \times a \quad (a \times b) \times c = a \times (b \times c) \\
\quad a \times (b + c) = a \times b + a \times c \quad (a + b) \times c = a \times c + b \times c \quad 0^* = 0 \quad 1^* = 1 \\
\quad (a + b)^* = a^* + b^* \quad (a \times b)^* = a^* \times b^* \quad (a^*)^* = a \quad (B \cdot K)^* = K^\dagger \cdot B^\dagger \\
\text{(AX-DELTA)} \quad \delta_{s,t}^* = \delta_{s,t} \quad \langle s | \cdot |t \rangle = \delta_{s,t} \quad \delta_{s,s} = 1 \quad s \neq t \vdash_{A_{DN}} \delta_{s,t} = 0 \quad \delta_{s,t} = \delta_{t,s} \\
\text{(AX-LINEAR)} \quad \mathbf{0} + D = D \quad D_1 + D_2 = D_2 + D_1 \quad (D_1 + D_2) + D_3 = D_1 + (D_2 + D_3) \\
\quad \mathbf{0} \cdot D = \mathbf{0} \quad a \cdot \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0} \quad 1 \cdot D = D \\
\quad a \cdot (b \cdot D) = (a \times b) \cdot D \quad (a + b) \cdot D = a \cdot D + b \cdot D \quad a \cdot (D_1 + D_2) = a \cdot D_1 + a \cdot D_2 \\
\text{(AX-BILINEAR)} \quad D \cdot \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0} \quad D_1 \cdot (a \cdot D_2) = a \cdot (D_1 \cdot D_2) \quad D_0 \cdot (D_1 + D_2) = D_0 \cdot D_1 + D_0 \cdot D_2 \\
\quad \mathbf{0} \cdot D = \mathbf{0} \quad (a \cdot D_1) \cdot D_2 = a \cdot (D_1 \cdot D_2) \quad (D_1 + D_2) \cdot D_0 = D_1 \cdot D_0 + D_2 \cdot D_0 \\
\quad D \otimes \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0} \quad D_1 \otimes (a \cdot D_2) = a \cdot (D_1 \otimes D_2) \quad D_0 \otimes (D_1 + D_2) = D_0 \otimes D_1 + D_0 \otimes D_2 \\
\quad \mathbf{0} \otimes D = \mathbf{0} \quad (a \cdot D_1) \otimes D_2 = a \cdot (D_1 \otimes D_2) \quad (D_1 + D_2) \otimes D_0 = D_1 \otimes D_0 + D_2 \otimes D_0 \\
\text{(AX-ADJOINT)} \quad \mathbf{0}^\dagger = \mathbf{0} \quad (D^\dagger)^\dagger = D \quad (a \cdot D)^\dagger = a^* \cdot (D^\dagger) \quad (D_1 + D_2)^\dagger = D_1^\dagger + D_2^\dagger \\
\quad (D_1 \cdot D_2)^\dagger = D_2^\dagger \cdot D_1^\dagger \quad (D_1 \otimes D_2)^\dagger = D_1^\dagger \otimes D_2^\dagger \\
\text{(AX-COMP)} \quad D_0 \cdot (D_1 \cdot D_2) = (D_0 \cdot D_1) \cdot D_2 \\
\quad (D_1 \otimes D_2) \cdot (D_3 \otimes D_4) = (D_1 \cdot D_3) \otimes (D_2 \cdot D_4) \\
\quad (K_1 \cdot B) \cdot K_2 = (B \cdot K_2) \cdot K_1 \quad B_1 \cdot (K \cdot B_2) = (B_1 \cdot K) \cdot B_2 \\
\quad (B_1 \otimes B_2) \cdot (K_1 \otimes K_2) = (B_1 \cdot K_1) \times (B_2 \cdot K_2) \\
\text{(AX-GROUND)} \quad \mathbf{1}_O^\dagger = \mathbf{1}_O \quad \mathbf{1}_O \cdot D = D \quad \mathbf{1}_O \otimes \mathbf{1}_O = \mathbf{1}_O \\
\quad |t\rangle^\dagger = \langle t| \quad |s\rangle \otimes |t\rangle = |(s, t)\rangle
\end{array}$$

Fig. 6. Axiomatic semantics of DN. Associativity is marked in blue, and commutativity is marked in red. Symbol  $D$  represents appropriate terms from the ket, bra, or operator sorts. The type annotations for  $\mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{1}$  follow the typing rule and are omitted here. The symbol  $\vdash_{A_{DN}}$  is omitted for the axioms without conditions.

PROOF. By induction on the structure of the typing derivation.  $\square$

*Example 5.8.* Assume context  $\Gamma = \{i : A, K : \mathcal{K}(A)\}$  and valuation  $v = \{A \mapsto \{0, 1\}, i \mapsto 0, K \mapsto \mathbf{v}\}$ , where  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{H}_{\{0,1\}}$ . We can check that both expressions  $\langle i | \cdot (K \cdot \langle i |)$  and  $(\langle i | \cdot K) \cdot \langle i |$  have the type  $\mathcal{B}(A)$ . Their semantics are calculated by

$$\llbracket \langle i | \cdot (K \cdot \langle i |) \rrbracket = \llbracket \langle i | \rrbracket \cdot \llbracket [K] \rrbracket \cdot \llbracket \langle i | \rrbracket \rrbracket = \langle 0 | \cdot (\mathbf{v} \cdot \langle 0 |) = (\langle 0 | \cdot \mathbf{v}) \langle 0 | = \llbracket (\langle i | \cdot K) \cdot \langle i | \rrbracket$$

Both calculation results turn out to be the dual vector along 0-basis, with the norm of the projection from  $\mathbf{v}$  as the coefficient. In fact, these two expressions have identical semantics under all valuation, meaning that we can prove  $\llbracket \langle i | \cdot (K \cdot \langle i |) \rrbracket = \llbracket (\langle i | \cdot K) \cdot \langle i | \rrbracket$  in context  $\Gamma$ .

#### 5.4 Axiomatic Semantics

The reasoning in Example 5.8 goes down to the interpretation level, which can be inefficient and unnecessary in most cases. Alternatively, we can axiomatize the equivalence implied in the denotational semantics as a proof system and operate on the syntax directly. This results in the axiomatic semantics  $A_{DN}$ .

*Definition 5.9.* The axiomatic semantics of DN is the formal proof system  $A_{DN}$  defined in Figure 6.

The axioms for the same overloaded symbol in different sorts are identical in their forms, so we express them in a unified way with the symbol  $D$  for all sorts. Notice that (AX-COMP) collects all axioms for composition rearranging. In the axiom  $s \neq t \vdash_{A_{DN}} \delta_{s,t} = 0$ , the premise  $s \neq t$  is satisfied by different constant bases. The formal proof system  $A_{DN}$  is sound in the sense that the axioms as equations hold in the denotational semantics.

LEMMA 5.10 (SOUNDNESS OF AXIOMATIC SEMANTICS). *For all axioms  $e_1 = e_2$  in  $A_{DN}$ , we have  $\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket$ .*

PROOF. Constructed and checked in Coq. □

Example 5.11. The equation in Example 5.8 can be proved by the axiom  $B_1 \cdot (K \cdot B_2) = (B_1 \cdot K) \cdot B_2$  from (AX-TENSOR).

## 6 First-Order Theory of Dirac Notation

The first-order theory of Dirac notation is a typed theory built in the usual way. Atomic formulae are of the form  $e = e'$ , where  $e$  and  $e'$  are expressions of the same type. Formulae are built from atomic formulae using logical connectives and quantifiers. Note that we allow quantification over all types.

Definition 6.1 (Axioms). The axioms of the theory are

- Basis: every bra and ket can be decomposed as a complex combination of the basis elements,

$$K = k_1 \cdot |1\rangle + k_2 \cdot |2\rangle + \cdots + k_n \cdot |n\rangle, \quad B = b_1 \cdot \langle 1| + b_2 \cdot \langle 2| + \cdots + b_n \cdot \langle n|,$$

$$O = (o_{1,1} \cdot |1\rangle \cdot \langle 1|) + (o_{1,2} \cdot |1\rangle \cdot \langle 2|) + \cdots + (o_{1,m} \cdot |1\rangle \cdot \langle m|) + \cdots + (o_{n,m} \cdot |n\rangle \cdot \langle m|),$$

where  $k_i = \langle i| \cdot K$ ,  $b_i = B \cdot |i\rangle$  and  $o_{i,j} = \langle i| \cdot (O \cdot |j\rangle)$  are corresponding entries.

- $\delta$ -axioms:  $\delta_{s,s} = 1$ ,  $\delta_{s,t} = 1$  (for different constants  $s, t$ ).

Every finite-dimensional Hilbert space over the complex field is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , where  $n$  denotes the dimension of the Hilbert space. In our language, the basis axioms transform ket, bra, and operator variables into the scalar coefficients  $\langle i| \cdot K$ ,  $B \cdot |i\rangle$  and  $\langle i| \cdot O \cdot |j\rangle$ , which can be replaced by single variables. Also, the new symbol  $\delta_{s,t}$  can be dealt with with the  $\delta$ -axioms. Therefore, this transform reduces the theory of Dirac notations to that of complex numbers, which is decidable.

THEOREM 6.2. *The first-order theory of Dirac notations on fixed dimensional Hilbert spaces is decidable.*

PROOF. Every quantifier-free formula is equivalent to a quantifier-free in the theory of complex numbers. This follows from the facts that every operator is uniquely defined by its value on the basis of its domain (using the axiom of basis), every vector is uniquely defined by its decomposition in the basis (using the axiom of basis), and every vector in the dual space is uniquely defined by its value on the basis of its domain (again, using the axiom of basis). Similarly, every quantifier over operators, vectors, and dual vectors can be reduced to a sequence of quantification over complex numbers. It follows that if the Hilbert space dimensions are known, every formula in the theory of Dirac notation is logically equivalent to a formula in the theory of complex numbers, which is decidable. The decidability also trivially extends to big operators with given index sets. □

Unfortunately, deciding a formula in Dirac notation by reduction to the theory of reals is generally computationally intractable, in particular, because the complexity of quantifier elimination is doubly exponential in the dimension of the Hilbert space. Nevertheless, the next section provides a procedure for checking the equality of Dirac expressions.

## 7 A Term-Rewriting System for Equalities

Our work considers a variant of term-rewriting, called AC-rewriting, that is tailored for equational theories with associative, commutative and associative-commutative symbols. Specifically, we define an AC rewriting system such that every expression can be reduced to a unique normal form modulo AC axioms. The existence and unicity of normal forms is established by termination and local confluence.

### 7.1 Rewriting Modulo for Dirac Notation

We define a rewriting modulo system for Dirac notation as follows. For the equational part, we declare  $+$  and  $\times$  as associative and commutative symbols for all sorts and  $\delta$  as a commutative symbol, which are listed below.

$$\begin{array}{lll} X + Y = Y + X & (X + Y) + Z = X + (Y + Z) & \text{(for all sorts)} \\ a \times b = b \times a & (a \times b) \times c = a \times (b \times c) & \delta_{s,t} = \delta_{t,s} \end{array}$$

Some rules involving  $X \cdot Y$  appear to be associative but are not included in the AC equational theory above. Some of the rules consist of different overloaded symbols of  $X \cdot Y$ . Additionally, solving associativity through encoded rules can be more efficient.

For the rewriting part, the full set of rules consists of more than 150 rules, presented in Appendix B. Here, we exhibit selected rules for clarity of exposition, following an incremental presentation (note that the incremental presentation is technically aligned with hierarchical combinations [55], which are used to decompose proofs into proofs about sub-systems, but this is not exploited in our results):

- (1) addition and scalar multiplication,
- (2) tensor product and outer product,
- (3) inner product and operator applications, and
- (4) conjugation and adjoints.

This decomposition reflects the logical structure of Dirac notations: tensor product and inner product are extended structures on the linear algebra. Also note that in our approach, the laws of conjugation and dual space are viewed as an incremental extension of inner and outer products.

Figure 7 presents some of the rules. We elaborate below.

*Linearity.* The first level of rules decides the axioms of scalar multiplication and addition. It also involves the rules for reducing delta and the rule for completion with pair basis in Equation (11).

*Tensor Product.* The second level decides the axioms of the tensor product and outer product. It includes common rules like linearity and distributivity. In Rule (12), the left hand side  $K_1 \cdot B_1$  and  $K_2 \cdot B_2$  are two operators constructed by outer product, and the tensor product of such two operators is rearranged to the outer product of  $K_1 \otimes K_2$  and  $B_1 \otimes B_2$ . In the traditional Dirac notation, this is expressed as  $(|v_1\rangle \langle u_1|) \otimes (|v_2\rangle \langle u_2|) = (|v_1\rangle |v_2\rangle) \otimes (\langle u_1| \langle u_2|)$ .

*Multiplication.* The third level decides the axioms involving inner product and operator multiplications. Here, the complexity arises from the Hilbert space structure. An important intuition is that we always prefer multiplication over tensor product when possible, since multiplication may finally reduced to inner products and scalars. Also, as in Rule (13) and (15), we decompose the multiplication (inner product) when at least one side is explicitly in tensor product form. To address the ‘‘associativity’’ of multiplications by rewriting, Rule (14) sorts the multiplication to the right, and Rule (15) is for completion of sorting.



$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{(R-SCALAR)} \quad 0 + a \triangleright a \quad 1 \times a \triangleright a \quad a \times (b + c) \triangleright a \times b + a \times c \\
\text{(R-S-DELTA)} \quad \delta s, s \triangleright 1 \quad \delta_{(s_1, s_2), (t_1, t_2)} \triangleright \delta_{s_1, t_1} \times \delta_{s_2, t_2} \\
\text{(R-KET-SCR)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\sigma)}{0.K \triangleright \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}(\sigma)}} \quad 1.K \triangleright K \quad a.\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}(\sigma)} \triangleright \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}(\sigma)} \\
\text{(R-KET-ADD)} \quad a.(b.K) \triangleright (a \times b).K \quad a.(K_1 + K_2) \triangleright a.K_1 + a.K_2 \\
K + \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}(\sigma)} \triangleright K \quad K + K \triangleright (1 + 1).K \quad a.K + b.K \triangleright (a + b).K \\
\\
\text{(R-KET-TSR)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\tau)}{\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}(\sigma)} \otimes K \triangleright \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}(\sigma \times \tau)}} \quad |s\rangle \otimes |t\rangle \triangleright |(s, t)\rangle \\
K_1 \otimes (a.K_2) \triangleright a.(K_1 \otimes K_2) \quad (K_1 + K_2) \otimes K_3 \triangleright K_1 \otimes K_3 + K_2 \otimes K_3 \\
\text{(R-OP-TSR)} \quad \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma) \otimes \mathbf{1}_O(\tau) \triangleright \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma \times \tau) \\
(K_1 \cdot B_1) \otimes (K_2 \cdot B_2) \triangleright (K_1 \otimes K_2) \cdot (B_1 \otimes B_2) \\
\text{(R-OP-OUTER)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\tau)}{\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}(\sigma)} \cdot B \triangleright \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau)} \\
\\
\text{(R-S-DOT)} \quad \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{B}}(\sigma) \cdot K \triangleright 0 \quad \langle s| \cdot |t\rangle \triangleright \delta_{s,t} \\
(a.B) \cdot K \triangleright a \times (B \cdot K) \quad (B_1 + B_2) \cdot K \triangleright B_1 \cdot K + B_2 \cdot K \\
(B_1 \otimes B_2) \cdot |(s, t)\rangle \triangleright (B_1 \cdot |s\rangle) \times (B_2 \cdot |t\rangle) \\
(B \cdot O) \cdot K \triangleright B \cdot (O \cdot K) \\
(B_1 \otimes B_2) \cdot ((O_1 \otimes O_2) \cdot K) \triangleright ((B_1 \cdot O_1) \otimes (B_2 \cdot O_2)) \cdot K \\
\text{(R-KET-MLT)} \quad \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) \cdot K \triangleright \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}(\sigma)} \quad \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma) \cdot K \triangleright K \\
\\
\text{(R-S-CONJ)} \quad (a + b)^* \triangleright a^* + b^* \quad \delta_{s,t}^* \triangleright \delta_{s,t} \quad (B \cdot K)^* \triangleright K^\dagger \cdot B^\dagger \\
\text{(R-KET-ADJ)} \quad \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{B}}(\sigma)^\dagger \triangleright \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}(\sigma)} \quad \langle t|^\dagger \triangleright |t\rangle \quad (K^\dagger)^\dagger \triangleright K \quad (a.B)^\dagger \triangleright a^*.(B^\dagger) \\
(B_1 + B_2)^\dagger \triangleright B_1^\dagger + B_2^\dagger \quad (B \cdot O)^\dagger \triangleright O^\dagger \cdot B^\dagger \quad (B_1 \otimes B_2)^\dagger \triangleright B_1^\dagger \otimes B_2^\dagger \\
\text{(R-OP-ADJ)} \quad \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau)^\dagger \triangleright \mathbf{0}_O(\tau, \sigma) \quad \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma)^\dagger \triangleright \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma) \quad (K \cdot B)^\dagger \triangleright B^\dagger \cdot K^\dagger
\end{array}
\tag{11}$$

$$\tag{12}$$

$$\tag{13}$$

$$\tag{14}$$

$$\tag{15}$$

Fig. 7. A selection of representative rules from  $R_{\text{DN}}$ .

*Conjugate.* The fourth level decides the axioms involving conjugation and the dual space. Conjugation distributes to all other symbols and swaps the order of multiplications, similar to the conjugate transpose of matrix multiplications.

## 7.2 Properties

In the remainder of this section, we prove that the AC rewrite system is sound with respect to the equational theory of DN, and we establish its local confluence and termination. Completeness is presented as a conjecture, and we provide the proof with expansions on bases.

The AC rewriting system  $R_{\text{DN}}$  defines a reduction relation, which helps in deciding the equational theory. We use  $e \rightarrow_{R_{\text{DN}}} e'$  to indicate that  $e$  is matched and rewritten once by a rule in  $R_{\text{DN}}$ , resulting in  $e'$  (modulo AC). The soundness of  $R_{\text{DN}}$  asserts that such rewritings will always preserve the type and semantics of the terms.

LEMMA 7.1 (SOUNDNESS OF  $R_{DN}$ ). *Let  $\Gamma$  be a context and  $e, e'$  be terms in DN. If  $e \rightarrow_{R_{DN}} e'$  and  $\Gamma \vdash e : T$  for some  $T$ , then  $\Gamma \vdash e' : T$  and  $\llbracket e \rrbracket = \llbracket e' \rrbracket$ .*

This makes the rewritings in  $R_{DN}$  similar to a simplification. By applying the rules repeatedly, we can expect to obtain a result where no more rules apply, which we call the normal form. The termination of  $R_{DN}$  guarantees that such rewritings will always end in a normal form.

LEMMA 7.2 (TERMINATION OF  $R_{DN}$ ). *There are no infinite rewriting sequences  $e_1 \rightarrow_{R_{DN}} e_2 \rightarrow_{R_{DN}} \dots$ .*

Moreover, the normal form of  $R_{DN}$  is independent of how the rules are applied. This is further proved by the local confluence of  $R_{DN}$  as follows.

LEMMA 7.3 (LOCAL CONFLUENCE OF  $R_{DN}$ ). *For well-typed DN terms  $u, v_1, v_2$  in context  $\Gamma$  satisfying  $v_1 \leftarrow_{R_{DN}} u \rightarrow_{R_{DN}} v_2$ , there exists  $w$  satisfying  $v_1 \rightarrow_{R_{DN}}^e w \leftarrow_{R_{DN}}^e v_2$ .*

Termination and local confluence of  $R_{DN}$  imply that for every well-typed term  $e$ , there is a unique normal form denoted as  $e \downarrow_{R_{DN}}$ . Therefore, we call  $R_{DN}$  *syntactically complete*. Now, we can propose the algorithm to decide the equations in the Dirac notation core language.

THEOREM 7.4. *For well-typed DN terms  $e_1, e_2$  in context  $\Gamma$ ,  $e_1 \downarrow_{R_{DN}} = e_2 \downarrow_{R_{DN}}$  implies  $\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket$ .*

PROOF. The unique normal form exists because  $R_{DN}$  is terminating and local confluent. The soundness of  $R_{DN}$  indicates that all terms in the rewriting sequence are semantically equivalent.  $\square$

$R_{DN}$  still needs to be complete to become a decision procedure. However, there are two fragments in our language which term-rewriting cannot decide. To decide whether  $\delta_{s,t}$  can be reduced to 0, we need to do the syntactical unification of  $s$  and  $t$ . Also,  $R_{DN}$  is not complete for some products of  $\delta$  operators. For example, we have  $\llbracket \delta_{i,j} \times \delta_{i,k} \rrbracket = \llbracket \delta_{i,j} \times \delta_{j,k} \rrbracket$ , but they are not provably equal. Therefore, we only consider the relative completeness, and present it as the following conjecture.

CONJECTURE 7.5 (RELATIVE COMPLETENESS OF  $R_{DN}$ ).  *$R_{DN}$  is relatively complete with respect to denotational semantics. That is, for all well-typed DN terms  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ ,  $\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket$  implies  $e_1 \downarrow_{R_{DN+}} = e_2 \downarrow_{R_{DN+}}$  (modulo the equivalence of  $\delta$  operator products), where  $R_{DN+}$  is  $R_{DN}$  extended with the decision procedure for the syntactical unification of the basis sort.*

We proved a weaker completeness result (Appendix D) with the decomposition in Definition 6.1. However, we failed to prove the general theorem because it is difficult to express the normal form using an inductive language.

### 7.3 Proof Techniques

The soundness proof involves comparing the denotational semantics of both sides in every rewriting rule. We formalized the semantics and rules based on the CoqQ [75] library in Coq, and proved the soundness of  $R_{DN}$ .

Due to the large number of rules, the termination and local confluence proofs are carried out using automated tools. The problem is that some rules have side conditions on types, which cannot be encoded into the tools directly. Therefore, we transform  $R_{DN}$  into an untyped system  $R'_{DN}$  simply by erasing type annotations. The termination and local confluence of the erased system imply the corresponding properties of  $R_{DN}$ . The system  $R'_{DN}$  is obtained by removing all premises and annotations of types from  $R_{DN}$ , for example:

$$\begin{array}{lcl}
 (R_{DN}) & \frac{\Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\beta)}{\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\alpha) \otimes K \triangleright \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\alpha \times \beta)} & \mathbf{1}_O(\alpha) \otimes \mathbf{1}_O(\beta) \triangleright \mathbf{1}_O(\alpha \times \beta), \\
 (R'_{DN}) & \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes K \triangleright \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}} & \mathbf{1}_O \otimes \mathbf{1}_O \triangleright \mathbf{1}_O.
 \end{array}$$

For termination, we encode  $R'_{\text{DN}}$  in the tool AProVE [31]. The proof is automatically generated, making use of automatic order finding with the well-known dependency pair technique [6]. For local confluence, the standard technique is to compute and check the critical pairs, i.e., the nontrivial pairs diverging from one term in rewriting. We encode the system  $R'_{\text{DN}}$  in the tool CiME2 [20] and confirmed that all 1501 critical pairs are joinable.

To deduce the termination and local confluence of  $R_{\text{DN}}$  from  $R'_{\text{DN}}$ , we prove that the rewritings and type erasure are commuting, and type erasure is an injection for well-typed terms. The proof then proceeds by demonstrating the synchronization between rewritings of  $R_{\text{DN}}$  and  $R'_{\text{DN}}$ .

The weaker completeness result is proved through a normal form of the reduction. The proof has two steps: firstly, all terms in DN will be transformed into the normal form after expanding on the bases and rewriting using  $R_{\text{DN}}$ ; and secondly for all normal terms, the semantical equivalence implies that they are identical.

For more details of the proof techniques, see Appendix C and Appendix D.

## 8 Dirac Notation Extended Language

The core language presents the framework for formalizing Dirac notation. It consists of the preliminary symbols and can be decided purely by an AC rewriting system. In this section, we extend the language with the important big operator  $\sum_{i \in M} e$ , which significantly enhances the expressivity of the language.

*Definition 8.1 (extended language DNE).* The **extended language of Dirac notation DNE** consists of the sorts and symbols of the core language with the following extensions:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{(set types)} & T ::= \text{Set}(\sigma), \\ \text{(set terms)} & M ::= x \mid \text{U}(\sigma) \mid M \times M, \\ \text{(big operator sum)} & a ::= \sum_{i \in M} a, \quad K ::= \sum_{i \in M} K, \quad B ::= \sum_{i \in M} B, \quad O ::= \sum_{i \in M} O. \end{array}$$

The index  $i$  for summation is a bind variable.  $M$  represents the index sets of summation.  $\text{U}(\sigma)$  represents the universal set of type  $\sigma$ , and  $M \times M$  denotes the Cartesian product.

The typing of DNE consists of extra rules in Figure 8. Here, the summation is over the basis, which takes values from the classical type  $\sigma$ . Notice that typing for the big operator sum requires checking the body type with an updated context  $\Gamma :: (i : \sigma)$ , indicating that  $i$  is a bind variable with the scope limited to the body expression.

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{U}(\sigma) : \text{Set}(\sigma)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M_1 : \text{Set}(\sigma) \quad \Gamma \vdash M_2 : \text{Set}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash M_1 \times M_2 : \text{Set}(\sigma \times \tau)} \\ \\ \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \text{Set}(\sigma) \quad \Gamma :: (i : \sigma) \vdash a : \mathcal{S}}{\Gamma \vdash \sum_{i \in M} a : \mathcal{S}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \text{Set}(\sigma) \quad \Gamma :: (i : \sigma) \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash \sum_{i \in M} K : \mathcal{K}(\tau)} \\ \\ \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \text{Set}(\sigma) \quad \Gamma :: (i : \sigma) \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash \sum_{i \in M} B : \mathcal{B}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \text{Set}(\sigma) \quad \Gamma :: (i : \sigma) \vdash O : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)}{\Gamma \vdash \sum_{i \in M} O : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)} \end{array}$$

Fig. 8. Extra typing rules for DNE.

The denotational semantics of DNE is defined in Figure 9. Recall that the semantics of type  $\sigma$  is interpreted as the set of Hilbert space bases. As the sum index  $i$  also takes values within the bases,

the sets for index values will be subsets of  $\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$ . Therefore, the set type  $\text{Set}(\sigma)$  is interpreted as the power set  $2^{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}$ , containing all index value subsets. The  $v[i \mapsto m]$  in sum indicates the valuation that updates  $v$  with variable  $i$  mapping to  $m$ . Hence, the semantics of sum is calculated by evaluating the body with all possible values for the bind variable and then summing up the results. It is easy to see that the denotational semantics are also sound with respect to typing.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(set types)} & \llbracket \text{Set}(\sigma) \rrbracket \equiv 2^{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}, \\
\text{(set terms)} & \llbracket \mathbf{U}(\sigma) \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket, \quad \llbracket M_1 \times M_2 \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket \times \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket, \\
\text{(sum)} & \llbracket \sum_{i \in M} a \rrbracket_v \equiv \sum_{m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket} \llbracket a \rrbracket_{v[i \mapsto m]}, \quad \llbracket \sum_{i \in M} K \rrbracket_v \equiv \sum_{m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket} \llbracket K \rrbracket_{v[i \mapsto m]}, \\
& \llbracket \sum_{i \in M} B \rrbracket_v \equiv \sum_{m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket} \llbracket B \rrbracket_{v[i \mapsto m]}, \quad \llbracket \sum_{i \in M} O \rrbracket_v \equiv \sum_{m \in \llbracket M \rrbracket} \llbracket O \rrbracket_{v[i \mapsto m]}.
\end{array}$$

Fig. 9. Denotational semantics of DNE symbols.

## 8.1 Equivalence Checking Algorithm

Checking the equivalence of expressions with big operators requires more advanced techniques. The equivalence checking algorithm of DNE is a combination of conditional rewriting rules, one-pass expansions, and  $\alpha$ -equivalence checking. These techniques are introduced in the order of their application as follows.

*Definition 8.2 (AC rewriting system  $R_{DNE}$ ).* The AC rewriting system  $R_{DNE}$  on signature DNE consists of all rules from  $R_{DN}$  and the extra rules in Figure 10.

In DN, substitution stays at the meta-language level. However, since we have bind variables in the sum, expressing substitutions in the expressions becomes necessary. We use  $e[x := s]$  to indicate the term  $e$  with variable  $x$  replaced by the term  $s$ . For variable name conflicts, we can always use a fresh variable for the sum index, e.g.,  $(\sum_{i \in M} \delta_{i,s}) [s := i] = \sum_{j \in M} \delta_{j,i}$ .

The insights behind the rules involving big operators are as follows. After introducing the sum, the same Dirac notation may have different representations. For example, in (R-SUM-CONST), we expand the identity operator from DN to the summation, which is closer to the normal form in  $R_{DNE}$ . The sum can be eliminated by delta operators in the body. Here, we only consider the case when  $\delta_{i,j}$  is reduced to 1 exactly once in the summation, which is the most common and interesting. Depending on whether  $j$  is another bind variable or not, (R-SUM-ELIM) gives the rules with useful sufficient premises. Rules in (R-SUM-PUSH) push all symbols into the big operator, so that potential calculations in DN can be carried out. Rule (16) in (R-SUM-ADD) splits the addition in big operators, and (17) is for completion. Finally, the bind variable of summation over the Cartesian product can be split, which is the rule in (R-SUM-INDEX).

Some equational theories of big operators cannot be decided by rewriting and are presented as axioms in Figure 11. They are applied through special techniques and algorithms elaborated in the implementation Section 9. During equivalence checking, it is sometimes necessary to expand the variable as in (SUM-EXPAND). This corresponds to inserting identity operators  $\sum_i |i\rangle \langle i|$  in human proof and essentially reduces the decision problem to reals. Because the expressions for index sets do not depend on previous bind variables, the successive big operator can be swapped, as stated in (SUM-SWAP). Then (ALPHA-EQ) states that bind variables' names do not matter in their equivalence.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(R-SET-SIMP)} & \mathbf{U}(\sigma) \times \mathbf{U}(\tau) \triangleright \mathbf{U}(\sigma \times \tau) \\
\text{(R-SUM-CONST)} & \sum_{i \in M} 0 \triangleright 0 \quad \sum_{i \in M} \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma) \triangleright \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma) \quad \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}}(\sigma) \triangleright \sum_{i \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma)} |i\rangle \cdot \langle i| \\
\text{(R-SUM-ELIM)} & \text{free}(i, s) \vdash \sum_{i \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma)} \delta_{i,s} \triangleright 1 \quad \text{free}(i, s) \vdash \sum_{i \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma)} (\delta_{i,s} \times a) \triangleright a[i := s] \\
& \text{free}(i, s) \vdash \sum_{i \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma)} ((\delta_{i,s} \times a).D) \triangleright a[i := s].D[i := s] \\
& \sum_{i \in M} \sum_{j \in M} \delta_{i,j} \triangleright \sum_{j \in M} 1 \quad \sum_{i \in M} \sum_{j \in M} (\delta_{i,j} \times a) \triangleright \sum_{j \in M} a[i := j] \\
& \sum_{i \in M} \sum_{j \in M} ((\delta_{i,j} \times a).D) \triangleright \sum_{j \in M} a[i := j].D[i := j] \\
\text{(R-SUM-PUSH)} & \left( \sum_{i \in M} a \right)^* \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} a^* \quad \left( \sum_{i \in M} D \right)^\dagger \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} D^\dagger \\
& \text{free}(i, D_2) \vdash \left( \sum_{i \in M} D_1 \right) \cdot D_2 \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} (D_1 \cdot D_2) \\
& \text{free}(i, D_2) \vdash \left( \sum_{i \in M} D_1 \right) \otimes D_2 \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} (D_1 \otimes D_2) \\
\text{(R-SUM-ADD)} & \sum_{i \in M} (X_1 + X_2) \triangleright \left( \sum_{i \in M} X_1 \right) + \left( \sum_{i \in M} X_2 \right) \tag{16} \\
& \sum_{i \in M} (a.X) + \sum_{i \in M} (\beta.X) \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} (a + \beta).X \tag{17} \\
\text{(R-SUM-INDEX)} & \text{free}(j, X) \wedge \text{free}(k, X) \vdash \sum_{i \in M_1 \times M_2} X \triangleright \sum_{j \in M_1} \sum_{k \in M_2} X[i := (j, k)]
\end{array}$$

Fig. 10. A selection of representative rules from  $R_{\text{DNE}}$ .  $\text{free}(i, A)$  means that variable  $i$  does not have free appearances in  $A$ . The symbol  $D$  represents terms in the ket, bra, or operator sorts, and  $X$  represents terms from all four sorts. Additionally, bind variables  $i, j, k$  always have different names.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(SUM-EXPAND)} & \frac{\Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\sigma)}{K = \sum_{i \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma)} (\langle i | \cdot K) \cdot |i\rangle} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\sigma)}{B = \sum_{i \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma)} (B \cdot |i\rangle) \cdot \langle i|} \\
& \frac{\Gamma \vdash O : \mathcal{O}(\sigma, \tau)}{O = \sum_{i \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma)} \sum_{j \in \mathbf{U}(\tau)} (\langle i | O | j \rangle) \cdot |i\rangle \langle j|} \\
\text{(SUM-SWAP)} & \sum_{i \in M} \sum_{j \in N} X = \sum_{j \in N} \sum_{i \in M} X \quad \text{(ALPHA-EQ)} \quad \sum_{i \in M} X = \sum_{j \in M} X[i := j]
\end{array}$$

Fig. 11. Axioms beyond  $R_{\text{DNE}}$ .  $X$  represents terms from scalar, ket, bra, or operator sorts. All bind variables  $i, j$  are different.

Finally, the overall algorithm for deciding the equivalence of extended language expressions is described below.

*Definition 8.3.* Let  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  be two expressions of DNE. The algorithm to decide their equivalence follows this sequence:

- (1) rewrite  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  into normal forms in  $R_{\text{DNE}}$  (modulo AC and (SUM-SWAP)),

- (2) apply (SUM-EXPAND) once on all the variables of ket, bra, and operator,
- (3) rewrite the results into  $R_{DNE}$  normal forms (modulo AC and (SUM-SWAP)), and
- (4) check the  $\alpha$ -equivalence of the results using (ALPHA-EQ).

We apply (SUM-EXPAND) iteratively once for every expression, as such expansions are idempotent together with  $R_{DNE}$ . Here, step (1) simplifies the expression before expansion and is introduced only for efficiency considerations. Because the rewriting by (ALPHA-EQ) commutes with all other rules, the  $\alpha$ -equivalence only needs to be checked for the normal forms in the end.

We verified the soundness of all rules and axioms, validating this algorithm. However, due to the existence of bind variables and special side conditions, we do not prove the confluence or termination of  $R_{DNE}$ .

LEMMA 8.4. *The rules in  $R_{DNE}$  and axioms in Figure 11 are sound w.r.t. the denotational semantics.*

PROOF. Constructed and proved in Coq. □

## 9 Implementation and Mechanization

### 9.1 Implementation

We have developed a Mathematica package, called `DiracDec`, based on our equational approach for Dirac notation. The choice of Mathematica is motivated by practical considerations, which are detailed below.

*9.1.1 Design and Implementation Choices.* The long-term goal of our work is to propose practical automated tools for quantum program verification. As a consequence, our implementation goes beyond the scope of the theory developed in the previous section. Our rationale is as follows:

- Mathematica has built-in support for trigonometric functions, exponential functions, and many other functions that are commonly used when specifying and reasoning about quantum systems. Building our prototype on top of Mathematica gives us additional expressivity for free. In contrast, many examples from the literature are not expressible in the basic DN theory and its extensions. Therefore, they would be out of scope of a direct implementation of DN;
- Mathematica allows to define new functions. For instance, one can define the function that maps every linear operator  $A : H \rightarrow H$  to its trace

$$\sum_{i \in U(\pi_K(\text{type}(A)))} \langle i | \cdot A \cdot | i \rangle$$

There are two interesting points to note about the trace. First, its definition uses big sums. Second, the index of the big sum ranges over the basis of  $H$ , therefore expressed by the dynamic typing introduced below;

- Mathematica offers support for matching and substitution modulo C and AC, which can be used directly to implement the rewrite system used for DN;
- Mathematica offers rudimentary support for interactive proofs, which is specially convenient for examples that fall outside of our core system.

In spite of its advantages, the use of Mathematica as a backend is a trade-off. First, the performance of `DiracDec` is constrained by the efficiency of Mathematica rewriting engine, and we can quickly reach examples that take long to verify, or time out. Further challenges with the choice of Mathematica are discussed below.

*9.1.2 Implementation Details.* We review some of the key features of our implementation.

*Big Sums.* Although Mathematica has the big sum, it is designed for scalars and does not admit the equational theories for DNE. As is discussed above, some axioms for the big operator cannot be decided by rewriting and are resolved by special techniques in the implementation. We take the equivalence of Equation (8) and Equation (10) as an example:

$$\sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in V} \langle j | M | i \rangle | j \rangle \otimes | i \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha\text{-equivalence}} \sum_{j \in V} \sum_{k \in V} \langle k | M | j \rangle | k \rangle \otimes | j \rangle \xrightarrow{\text{(SUM-SWAP)}} \sum_{k \in V} \sum_{j \in V} \langle k | M | j \rangle | k \rangle \otimes | j \rangle.$$

The  $\alpha$ -equivalence in the first equation is acknowledged by the renaming  $\{i \mapsto j, j \mapsto k\}$ , which is similar to a unifier (as long as we always use unique bind variables). Inspired by this, DiracDec checks  $\alpha$ -equivalence by a constrained AC-unification. That is, for expressions  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ , the variables for the unification are (renamed) big operator indices, with the constraint that index variables from the same expression cannot be assigned to each other. Then  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are  $\alpha$ -equivalent if and only if they can be unified.

(SUM-SWAP) proves the second equation above. Besides, the axiom is special since it implies that rewriting rules in  $R_{\text{DNE}}$  can also match other big operators in the successively nested chain of the sum. To deal with it, we group up big operators in DiracDec and modify the rewriting rules accordingly so that the order of indices does not matter. An intuitive understanding is that we transform  $\sum_{i \in M_1} \sum_{j \in M_2} X$  into  $\sum_{i \in M_1, j \in M_2} X$ , and rules now match patterns like  $\sum_{i \in M, \dots} X$ .

*Dynamic Typing.* The definition of the trace operator depends on the type of the operator. There is no primary mechanism to define typed rewriting rules in Mathematica. Therefore, DiracDec uses dynamic typing, in the form of an operator `type` that computes the type of an expression and can be used freely in expressions. For example, the trace symbol is formally defined as  $\text{tr}(A) \triangleq \sum_{i \in U(\pi_K(\text{type}(A)))} \langle i | \cdot A \cdot | i \rangle$  in DiracDec. Here  $\pi_K(\text{type}(A))$  calculates the classical type for the codomain of  $A$ , which is the value set for the sum index.

Dynamic typing improves efficiency with respect to fully typed annotated terms because it avoids tracing the type of all subterms, and the rewriting rules will not match the redundant type information. The soundness of rewriting rules with dynamic typing is also proved in Coq.

*Other Features.* We also made the following enhancements w.r.t the core language.

- DiracDec supports new symbols. For example, we have `fst` and `snd` as the projections on a pair basis, which follow the rules like `fst (s, t) > s`. Also, we allow constant classical types and index value sets (e.g., qubit  $\{0, 1\}$ ), and big operators over constant sets will be expanded when necessary. The semantics and rewriting rules are extended accordingly; see Appendix G.
- DiracDec adopts classical type variables. Classical type variables are used to quantify all Hilbert spaces so that we can prove more general equations on Dirac notations.
- We designed a user language that recovers the ambiguity of Dirac notations, which is closer to the loose notation people usually use. In the user language, many symbols like composition or tensor can be deduced from the universal composition  $X \circ Y$  using the type information. For example,  $X \circ Y$  is translated into the inner product, if we have  $\Gamma \vdash X : \mathcal{K}(\sigma)$  and  $\Gamma \vdash Y : \mathcal{B}(\sigma)$ .

The user language feature is only a parser and not essential. In Appendix F, we present the syntax, typing and rewriting rules for the Mathematica implementation system with the other two features introduced above. They will not invalidate the equivalences in  $R_{\text{DNE}}$ , as is shown by the embedding in between proved in the Coq mechanism.

*Demonstration.* Figure 12 illustrates the code used to encode and verify Example 3.1 from the motivating section. The code consists of a sequence of commands processed sequentially by Mathematica. It begins with definitions of `TPO` and `phi`. `TPO[A_]` is defined as the transpose of  $A$ ,






Fig. 12. The code for Example 3.1 is given on the left. Variables are marked in blue, symbols introduced in DiracDec are marked in brown, and definitions in the field are marked in purple. The explanations for each command are given on the right.

corresponding to  $A^T \triangleq \sum_i \sum_j \langle i|A|i\rangle |i\rangle \langle j|$ . It uses symbols like **TProjK** and **TCalc** to dynamically compute the type for sum index. The **phi**[T\_] is defined as the maximally entangled state on classical type  $T$ , i.e.,  $|\phi\rangle \triangleq \sum_i |i, i\rangle$ . These symbols are defined in the Mathematica environment in the field, serving as the language extensions. The code then specifies the context, declaring  $M$  as  $\mathcal{O}(T, T)$  type. Finally, it uses **DNEqQ** to check the type and test the equivalence of two expressions, confirming the positive results. The code also employs **DNNorm** to calculate the normal form, yielding  $\sum_{x_1 \in U(T), x_2 \in U(T)} \langle x_1 | M | x_2 \rangle |x_1, x_2\rangle$ , consistent with the human proof result in Section 3. Here, **SUMK** is the disambiguated internal symbol for the sum over ket, and **\$1**, **\$2** are unique bind variables generated by Mathematica.

## 9.2 Mechanization

To ensure the reliability of the rewriting system, especially the implementation of dynamic type extensions, we formalize the Dirac notation in Coq and prove the soundness of all rewriting rules. Our implementation is based on the MathComp [66] and CoqQ [75] libraries. MathComp is a state-of-the-art mathematical library that provides extensive basic theories. CoqQ is a general-purpose quantum computing and program verification framework built on MathComp and MathComp-Analysis [66]. Other mathematical libraries related to quantum computing, such as [38, 59], also serve as the base library for our formalization. We choose Mathcomp and CoqQ since (1) MathComp provides a comprehensive formalization of big operators and related theories, such as the lemmas about summation over finite sets; (2) CoqQ is compatible with MathComp and provides theories that relate classical data types and the associated Hilbert spaces. Based on these libraries, our formalization is directly built without further development of any relevant basic library.

Our formalization consists of three layers, as listed below:

- (Layer 1) core language (DN): define the syntax and denotational semantics (Figure 5), show the soundness of the axiomatic semantics (Figure 6) and all the rewriting rules (Figure 7);
- (Layer 2) Dirac notation extended language (DNE): define the syntax the denotational semantics (Figure 9);

(Layer 3) DNE with dynamic typing rules (faithfully corresponding to Mathematica implementation): define the syntax and denotational semantics and proves the soundness of all the rewriting rules shown in Appendix F.

We further enhance the reliability of `DiracDec` by revealing the consistency between these layers<sup>3</sup>: since each layer is an extension of the previous layer's syntax, we prove that terms have the same semantics (or types) after being embedded into the next layer. In other words, without concerning ourselves with the mechanics of dynamic typing, for any well-typed terms  $t_1, t_2 \in \text{DNE}$  and their corresponding embedding terms  $t'_1, t'_2 \in \text{Layer 3}$ , `DiracDec` decides whether  $t'_1 = t'_2$ . If this is the case, then  $t_1 = t_2$ .

## 10 Evaluation

We evaluate `DiracDec` on three classes of examples:

- `CoqQ`: [75] introduces a formally verified framework for proving properties of quantum programs in Coq. It includes comprehensive theories of linear algebra and super-operators. Our evaluation covers the framework itself, and applications to specific examples. As a primary motivation for this work, `CoqQ` is a natural target for our evaluation;
- Palsberg and Yu [56]: in a recent paper, Palsberg and Yu prove optimality of an implementation of a quantum gate with two control. Their proof makes an extensive use of Dirac notation rewriting, which makes it an excellent target for evaluation. Contrary to `CoqQ`, we only became aware of [56] towards the completion of this work, so our evaluation is more preliminary. Yet, we consider that it is a useful complement to our evaluation on `CoqQ`;
- (parametrized) quantum circuits: for completeness, we apply `DiracDec` to verification of quantum circuits. Our evaluation is very light, because this application is not in our initial scope. However, our evaluation suffices to confirm that our approach is not competitive with respect to the state-of-the-art in quantum circuit verification.

As a remark, another direct and popular way to verify the equivalence of expressions is to calculate using the numerical and matrix-based methods. The examples here involving free variables cannot be verified in this way, while, for concrete circuit verification, they are around 3 orders of magnitude faster than ours (milliseconds v.s. seconds).

### 10.1 CoqQ

Our first main focus in `CoqQ` is the formalization of linear algebra and super-operators. Our second focus is the formalization of correctness proofs of quantum algorithms. We also briefly consider examples that arise in the formalization of `QWhile`.

*Dirac Notation.* The formalizations of linear algebra and super-operators are mainly in the file `quantum.v`, from which we have manually and systematically extracted all the 1031 lemmas. See Table 1 for the statistics. Of these lemmas, 701 are completely beyond our expectations, i.e., they state inequalities, norms, ranks, topological properties, etc. Of the remaining 330 lemmas, 57 equations of linear operators and 109 equations of super-operators directly fall into the scope of our tool, and `DiracDec` successfully encoded 160 of them and proved 154 of them. The other 164 lemmas include predicates and conditions, such as the Hermiticity of an operator. Although `DiracDec` is not designed for solving these problems, we experimented with modeling the conditions by a simple substitution in Mathematica, and managed to solve 38 of them. The formalization of each lemma takes up to 20 lines of dense code in Coq and can be automatically proved in `DiracDec`. Here are some of the representative examples and their running time:

<sup>3</sup>Thus it is redundant to formalize the rewriting rules of layer 2 (DNE).

Type of Lemmas in CoqQ	Total	Expressible	Success	Fail
equations of linear operator (expected)	57	57	56	1
equations of super-operator (expected)	109	103	98	5
conditioned equations of linear operator (unexpected)	164	83	38	45
other properties of linear algebra (unexpected)	670	-	-	-
others (not about linear algebra, unexpected)	31	-	-	-
Total	1031	243	192	51

Table 1. Statistics of lemmas in CoqQ/quantum.v and our evaluation. We indicated by “expected” and “unexpected” of our original goal. All 1031 lemmas are classified as follows: equations of linear operator (57), equations of super-operator (109), conditioned equations of linear operator (164), conditioned equations of super-operator (75/670), inequalities of linear operators with respect to Löwner order (64/670), inequalities of super-operators with respect to induced Löwner order (24/670), other property (such as norm, rank or lemmas that do not assert equation/inequality) of linear operator (254/670), other property (such as norm or lemmas that do not assert equation/inequality) of super-operator (101/670), topological properties (such as limits, convergence, closed set, continuous) (152/670), and other lemmas do not about linear algebra (31).

- (1) (0.0099s)  $\langle k, p | ((|i\rangle \langle j| \otimes I) \cdot A) |q\rangle = \delta_{i,k} \langle j, p | A |q\rangle$ ,
- (2) (0.097s)  $c > 0 \rightarrow c \sum_{i \in T} (f_i \cdot X \cdot f_i^\dagger) = \sum_{i \in T} ((\sqrt{c} f_i \cdot X) \cdot (\sqrt{c} f_i^\dagger))$ ,
- (3) (0.18s)  $\sum_{i \in T} f_i \cdot (\sum_{j \in R} g_j \cdot X \cdot g_j^\dagger) \cdot f_i^\dagger = \sum_{i \in T \times R} f_{fst\ k} \cdot g_{snd\ k} \cdot X \cdot f_{fst\ k}^\dagger \cdot g_{snd\ k}^\dagger$
- (4) (0.068s)  $\sum_{i \in U} \langle i | \cdot (M \otimes N) \cdot |i\rangle = (\sum_{i \in U} \langle i | \cdot M \cdot |i\rangle) \times (\sum_{j \in U} \langle j | \cdot N \cdot |j\rangle)$ , and
- (5) (0.11s)  $\sum_{i \in U} \langle i | (\sum_{j,k} |j\rangle \langle k| \otimes (\sum_l E_l |j\rangle \langle k| E_l^\dagger) \cdot (\sum_{r \in U, t \in U} \langle r | X |t\rangle |t\rangle \langle r|) \otimes Y) |i\rangle$   
 $= \sum_{i \in U} \langle i | ((\sum_{j \in U} E_j \cdot X \cdot E_j^\dagger) \cdot Y) |i\rangle$

Interestingly, we are able to encode super-operators in the operator sum representation, and verify equations involving high-level definitions, such as their dual, composition, and Choi representations. The full list of encoded examples can be found in Appendix H, together with part of simple examples coming from `mxpred.v`. Most of the examples are involving free variables and thus cannot be verified by numerical methods.

*Verification of Quantum Programs.* Based on the formalization of quantum Hoare logic, a number of quantum circuits and algorithms are verified in CoqQ by proving the Hoare triples, including the quantum Fourier transformation, the HHL algorithm, the quantum phase estimation, the hidden subgroup problem and so on. As an example, the Hoare triples of the HHL algorithm is shown in Figure 1. Here we attempt to automate the deductions for the first time. To address the premises and conditions of the HHL algorithm, we introduce defined symbols and additional rewriting rules in Mathematica. For example, the quantum operation  $H_n$  is specified by the rule  $H_n |0\rangle \triangleright \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}} \sum_{i \in [n+1]} |i\rangle$ . Besides, some scalar equations are involved and cannot be resolved by Mathematica, e.g.,  $\sum_{j=1}^{n+1} e^{\frac{2\pi i j k}{n+1}} = (n+1) \times \delta_{k,0}$ . These equations are manually substituted during the reasoning process. Consequently, eight equations in Figure 1 are checked within 1.3 seconds with two manual interventions in scalars. The context specification and definitions take up approximately ten lines, and each equation is encoded in two lines of code. It should be mentioned that compared with path-sum-based program verification [2], ours is more suitable for abstract program verification; for large-scale programs based on circuit construction which does not fit our tool, QBricks [16] provides a high degree of automation, and the execution time is in seconds.

*Quantum Hoare Logic.* CoqQ uses Dirac notation as a basis for a Hoare logic for quantum program verification; the logic follows [72]. This formalization contains equations of the form:

$$\text{tr}(P_n \rho) = \text{tr}(P \llbracket (\mathbf{while} \{M_0, M_1\} \mathbf{do} S \mathbf{end})^n \rrbracket (\rho)), \quad \text{where} \begin{cases} P_0 = \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}}}, \\ P_{n+1} = M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger (wp.S.P_n) M_1. \end{cases}$$

The equation pertains to the logical value of quantum while program approximations, with the proof proceeding by induction on  $n$ . We verify the equation using DiracDec interactively. We give definitions to all symbols in Mathematica, including approximations  $P_n$ ,  $(\mathbf{while})^n$  and the weakest precondition  $wp.S.P$ . Here the induction hypothesis an equation, and is applied interactively by manual replacement. This intervention breaks the whole equivalence into two parts, which are checked by DiracDec. This example shows how DiracDec can be integrated in a theorem prover: the user provides crucial steps in the proving, and DiracDec solves the subgoals of rewriting Dirac notations.

## 10.2 Optimal 3-Qubit Gates

Palsberg and Yu [56] prove the optimal implementation of 3-qubit quantum gates, including for example, five 2-qubit gates are necessary for a Toffoli gate. Elementary Dirac notation reasonings occupy a large portion of the theoretical work. By our counting, there are 125 statements related to equational rewriting in this work, out of which 98 are in the scope of our tool. Consistent with the article, defined symbols are used extensively, and DiracDec is able to expand all the definitions and do the simplification. For example, the controlled- $E$  gate  $C(E)$  is expanded into  $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes I + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes E$ , and  $\text{Diag}(u_0, u_1) \triangleq u_0 |0\rangle\langle 0| + u_1 |1\rangle\langle 1|$ . The reasons why other statements cannot be encoded are (a) there are existential quantifiers, (b) there are symbols we cannot define, such as Eigenvalues, or (c) the equation has some premises or conditions that we cannot encode. Some of the encoded examples and their running time are listed below.

- (1) (0.0097s)  $C(\text{Diag}(u_0, u_1)) = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes I + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \text{Diag}(u_0, u_1)$ ,
- (2) (0.13s)  $(I \otimes P)C(\text{Diag}(u_0, u_1)) = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes P + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes P \text{Diag}(u_0, u_1)$ ,
- (3) (timeout)  $(I \otimes P)U(I \otimes P)U^\dagger$ ,  
where  $P = e^{-i\theta/2} |0\rangle\langle 0| + e^{i\theta/2} |1\rangle\langle 1|$ ,  $U = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes X + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes I$ .

## 10.3 Parametrized Quantum Circuits




Fig. 13. An example of two equivalent parametrised quantum circuits and their Dirac notation representations.

Quantum circuits are the low-level model for manipulating quantum computers. Static circuits (i.e., no measurement and classical control) can be represented by a unitary operator denoting their functionality, and DiracDec can check their equivalence in this way. Here is an example [40] of parametrised quantum circuits in Figure 13. The two circuits consist of the bit-flip gate  $X$ , the controlled- $X$  gate  $CX$ , and the  $Z$ -rotation  $R_z$  with a parameter. In their Dirac notation representations, identity operators  $1_O$  are inserted properly where the operation is absent. This example

takes 8.5 seconds to check, much slower than the verification examples from CoqQ. In comparison, PyZX [43] can verify concrete quantum circuits much faster, i.e., seconds for circuits with thousands of gates, and Hong et al. [40] uses a compact decision diagram representation to decide such small circuits in milliseconds.

*Efficiency.* For the 243 typical Dirac notation examples from CoqQ, it takes DiracDec 0.245 s to decide them in average. The maximum running time is 6.20 s, and 90% examples are finished within 0.55 s. We observed that efficiency problems often arise when there are additions of many subterms. This is the case for quantum circuit calculations, where concrete gates are encoded as the addition of their decompositions on the bases. Such problems arise because our rewriting is powered by the general form of AC-matching (pattern matching modulo associativity and commutativity), which is a NP-hard problem [10]. This can be avoided in practice, by using a compact representation and smarter matching algorithms.

## 11 Related Work

A large body of work explores the semantics and logical foundations of quantum systems. A lot of this work is inspired by Abramsky and Coecke’s seminal work on categorical foundations of quantum computation [1]. In this section, we review some of the most relevant related work.

*ZX-Calculi.* The ZX-calculus [18, 69] is a popular graphical formalism that has been used in many applications related to quantum computing [69]. The basic objects of the formalism are ZX-diagrams, which capture linear maps between qubits. As with other string diagrams, ZX-diagrams are naturally equipped with a notion of equivalence up to deformation. Further identities can be modelled by means of rewrite rules, that transform ZX-diagrams into simpler forms. A major question with the ZX-calculus is whether one set of rewrite rules is sound and complete for a class of circuits. This problem was studied extensively; see [69] for a historical account. An important milestone is the completeness of the Clifford+T fragment, which was established in 2017 by Jeandel et al [42]. Further results prove completeness in more advanced settings, e.g. [15, 58] considers completeness for arbitrary dimensions and superoperators. Some completeness results, and some applications of the ZX-calculus to optimization are based on computing normal forms. For instance, Duncan et al. [24] provide an algorithm to simplify Clifford circuits into a normal form that is asymptotically optimal in their size.

The ZX-calculus is used both as a theoretical tool, and as a practical tool, via implementations such as PyZX [43], or certified implementations such as VyZX [47].

*Path Sums.* Path sums [2] is a representation of unitaries inspired by the path integral approach to quantum mechanics. A path sum is an expression of the form

$$|x\rangle \mapsto \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_2^m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}} \exp^{2\pi i \phi(x,y)} |f(x,y)\rangle$$

where  $\phi$  is a phase polynomial,  $f$  is an output signature, and  $y$  is a vector of path variables. This representation is closed under parallel and sequential composition, which can be used to interpret measurement-free quantum circuits as path sums.

One advantage of the path sum representation of quantum circuits is that it equates structurally equivalent circuits without the need to use string diagrams. In addition, one can define reduction rules to simplify path sums into simpler but semantically equivalent ones. In particular, Amy [2] extracts a set of reduction rules from a careful analysis of the path sum encodings of some well-known identities for Clifford-group circuits. One key property of these rules is that the number of path variables strictly decreases at each reduction step, which ensures that reduction terminates.

Although these rules do not achieve unique normal forms for general path sums, Amy [2] proves that the uniqueness of normal forms holds for Clifford-group circuits, from which he derives that equivalence of Clifford-group circuits is decidable in polynomial time. While this initial work is focused on Clifford-group circuits, the path sum framework can be used in other settings. Vilmart [70] proposes a set of rewrite rules for Toffoli-Hadamard circuits, and proves termination and completeness of the rules via a translation to the ZH calculus [7]. Amy [3] considers the path sum representations with unbalanced coefficients, and provides complete equational theories over rings and fields.

Parametric path sums [16] is a generalization of path sums. Its goal is to model parametrized quantum circuits; the advantage of such circuits is that proofs can be established once and for all, independently of the size of the circuit inputs. Parametric path sums are used as a basis for QBricks, an automated verification tool that uses Why3 as a backend.

*Other Works on Completeness and Confluence.* One line of work establishes general completeness results for the internal language of the categorical structures, including symmetric monoidal categories, traced monoidal categories, and dagger categories [35, 61].

Another line of work studies the confluence of quantum  $\lambda$ -calculi [5, 44, 45]. Our work is closest to [5], which introduces a linear-algebraic  $\lambda$ -calculus called Lineal. Following Lineal, a sequence of work by Díaz-Caro et al. further explores type systems to model the quantum computation concepts like measurements [22, 25] and orthogonality [26].

*Formal Verification of Quantum Programs.* Verification of quantum programs has been an active area of research for the past two decades [17]. Ying [71] establishes the first (relatively) complete Floyd-Hoare logic for quantum programs. More recently, deductive program verification has been developed for various scenarios, including relational logic [8, 68], abstract interpretation [29, 73], separation logic [36, 46, 50, 62, 74], and robust reasoning [41, 64]. These proposed proof rules are used for reasoning about quantum programs, often with the assistance of rewriting Dirac equations. Among these, the equational theory is crucial for deriving specific properties or equalities of programs, sharing a similar methodology (e.g., rewriting) that we adopt in this work.

*Mechanizations of Quantum Computations.* Mechanized approaches for quantum program verification have garnered significant attention; see [49] for a comprehensive review. Numerous works aim to formalize the semantics of quantum circuits or programs from first principles and prove the properties subsequently. This line of research includes Coq-based formalizations [37, 39, 59, 75], as well as Isabelle/HOL-based formalizations [13, 14, 51]. Dirac notation is used and introduced in several of these works to enhance readability and usability. Notably, CoqQ [75] provides the first formalization of labeled Dirac notation to facilitate deduction when multiple variables are involved.

## 12 Conclusion and Future Work

This paper proposes the first automated method for proving equalities between expressions based on Dirac notation. Our work lays the groundwork for future integration of automated methods into proof assistants and program verification tools, as well as the further development of automated reasoning for quantum physics and computation. We elaborate below.

*Integration within Proof Assistants.* An exciting direction for future work is to integrate our approach in a foundational verifier for quantum programs, in particular CoqQ [75]. Such an integration can take the form of a certificate checker that takes as input an externally produced sequence of rewriting steps, or of a reflexive tactic that provably computes the normal form of an expression. Existing libraries for term-rewriting such as COLOR [12] could serve as a starting point for our endeavour, but further extensions would be required to deal with DN.

*Integration with Program Verifiers.* While there are several theories for the quantum Hoare logic [30, 71, 76], a significant challenge in practical application is the lack of predicate logic, i.e., the language to represent the predicates and reason with quantum operations. Since these concepts are also described using Dirac notations, it appears to be a promising solution to integrate our theory and tool in program verifiers.

*Language Extensions.* For practical purposes, it would be highly beneficial to incorporate more sorts, more predicates, and finer typing. In particular, it would be valuable to define capture different classes of operators, and to introduce typed rewrite rules which capture the nature of these operators.

*Big Sums.* An important direction for future work is to extend our formalisms and results to richer classes of big sums. Because such big sums are generally considered in the context of proof assistants [11], one challenge is to carve out a general yet tractable syntax for big sums. One promising direction would be to take inspiration from work on array logics [21, 60].

### **Acknowledgement**

This research was supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) as part of the Excellence Strategy of the German Federal and State Governments – EXC 2092 CASA - 390781972 and by the National Key R&D Program of China under Grant No. 2023YFA1009403.



## References

- [1] Samson Abramsky and Bob Coecke. 2004. A Categorical Semantics of Quantum Protocols. In *19th IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2004), 14-17 July 2004, Turku, Finland, Proceedings*. IEEE Computer Society, 415–425. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2004.1319636>
- [2] Matthew Amy. 2019. Towards Large-scale Functional Verification of Universal Quantum Circuits. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 287 (Jan. 2019), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.4204/eptcs.287.1>
- [3] Matthew Amy. 2023. Complete Equational Theories for the Sum-Over-Paths with Unbalanced Amplitudes. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 384 (Aug. 2023), 127–141. <https://doi.org/10.4204/eptcs.384.8>
- [4] Pablo Arrighi and Gilles Dowek. 2005. A Computational Definition of the Notion of Vectorial Space. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 117 (1 2005), 249–261. Issue SPEC. ISS.. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENTCS.2004.06.013>
- [5] Pablo Arrighi and Gilles Dowek. 2017. Lineal: A linear-algebraic Lambda-calculus. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* Volume 13, Issue 1 (3 2017), 1–33. Issue 1. [https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-13\(1:8\)2017](https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-13(1:8)2017)
- [6] Thomas Arts and Jürgen Giesl. 2000. Termination of term rewriting using dependency pairs. *Theoretical Computer Science* 236 (4 2000), 133–178. Issue 1-2. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(99\)00207-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(99)00207-8)
- [7] Miriam Backens and Aleks Kissinger. 2018. ZH: A Complete Graphical Calculus for Quantum Computations Involving Classical Non-linearity. In *Proceedings 15th International Conference on Quantum Physics and Logic, QPL 2018, Halifax, Canada, 3-7th June 2018 (EPTCS, Vol. 287)*, Peter Selinger and Giulio Chiribella (Eds.), 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.287.2>
- [8] Gilles Barthe, Justin Hsu, Mingsheng Ying, Nengkun Yu, and Li Zhou. 2019. Relational Proofs for Quantum Programs. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 4, POPL, Article 21 (December 2019), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3371089>
- [9] Fabian Bauer-Marquart, Stefan Leue, and Christian Schilling. 2023. symQV: Automated Symbolic Verification of Quantum Programs. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)* 14000 LNCS (2023), 181–198. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27481-7\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27481-7_12)
- [10] Dan Benanav, Deepak Kapur, and Paliath Narendran. 1987. Complexity of matching problems. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* 3, 1 (1987), 203–216. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-7171\(87\)80027-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-7171(87)80027-5)
- [11] Yves Bertot, Georges Gonthier, Sidi Ould Biha, and Ioana Pasca. 2008. Canonical big operators. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)* 5170 LNCS (2008), 86–101. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-71067-7\\_11/COVER](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-71067-7_11/COVER)
- [12] Frédéric Blanqui and Adam Koprowski. 2011. CoLoR: a Coq library on well-founded rewrite relations and its application to the automated verification of termination certificates. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.* 21, 4 (2011), 827–859. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129511000120>
- [13] Anthony Bordg, Hanna Lachnitt, and Yijun He. 2020. Isabelle marries dirac: A library for quantum computation and quantum information. *Archive of Formal Proofs* (2020).
- [14] Anthony Bordg, Hanna Lachnitt, and Yijun He. 2021. Certified quantum computation in Isabelle/HOL. *Journal of Automated Reasoning* 65, 5 (2021), 691–709. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-020-09584-7>
- [15] Titouan Carrette, Timothée Hoffreumon, Émile Larroque, and Renaud Vilmart. 2023. Complete Graphical Language for Hermiticity-Preserving Superoperators. In *2023 38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS56636.2023.10175712>
- [16] Christophe Chareton, Sébastien Bardin, François Bobot, Valentin Perrelle, and Benoît Valiron. 2021. An Automated Deductive Verification Framework for Circuit-building Quantum Programs. In *Programming Languages and Systems: 30th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2021, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2021, Luxembourg City, Luxembourg, March 27 – April 1, 2021, Proceedings* (Luxembourg City, Luxembourg). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 148–177. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72019-3\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72019-3_6)
- [17] Christophe Chareton, Sébastien Bardin, Dong Ho Lee, Benoît Valiron, Renaud Vilmart, and Zhaowei Xu. 2023. Formal Methods for Quantum Algorithms. In *Handbook of Formal Analysis and Verification in Cryptography*. CRC Press, 319–422. <https://cea.hal.science/cea-04479879>
- [18] Bob Coecke and Ross Duncan. 2008. Interacting Quantum Observables. In *Automata, Languages and Programming*, Luca Aceto, Ivan Damgård, Leslie Ann Goldberg, Magnús M. Halldórsson, Anna Ingólfssdóttir, and Igor Walukiewicz (Eds.), Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 298–310. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70583-3\\_25](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70583-3_25)
- [19] George E. Collins. 1976. Quantifier Elimination for Real Closed Fields by Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition: a synopsis. *SIGSAM Bull.* 10, 1 (Feb. 1976), 10–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1093390.1093393>
- [20] Évelyne Contejean, Pierre Courtieu, Julien Forest, Olivier Pons, and Xavier Urbain. 2011. Automated certified proofs with CiME3. *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics, LIPIcs* 10 (2011), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.RTA.2011.21-/STATS>
- [21] Przemysław Daca, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Andrey Kupriyanov. 2016. Array Folds Logic. In *Computer Aided Verification – 28th International Conference, CAV 2016, Toronto, ON, Canada, July 17-23, 2016, Proceedings, Part II (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 9780)*, Swarat Chaudhuri and Azadeh Farzan (Eds.). Springer, 230–248. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-32628-1\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-32628-1_14)

[//doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-41540-6\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-41540-6_13)

- [22] Alejandro Díaz-Caro and Gilles Dowek. 2017. Typing Quantum Superpositions and Measurement. In *Theory and Practice of Natural Computing*, Carlos Martín-Vide, Roman Neruda, and Miguel A. Vega-Rodríguez (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 281–293. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71069-3\\_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71069-3_22)
- [23] Paul Adrien Maurice Dirac. 1939. A new notation for quantum mechanics. In *Mathematical proceedings of the Cambridge philosophical society*, Vol. 35. Cambridge University Press, 416–418. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305004100021162>
- [24] Ross Duncan, Aleks Kissinger, Simon Perdrix, and John van de Wetering. 2020. Graph-theoretic Simplification of Quantum Circuits with the ZX-calculus. *Quantum* 4 (June 2020), 279. <https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2020-06-04-279>
- [25] Alejandro Díaz-Caro, Gilles Dowek, and Juan Pablo Rinaldi. 2019. Two linearities for quantum computing in the lambda calculus. *Biosystems* 186 (2019), 104012. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystems.2019.104012> Selected papers from the International Conference on the Theory and Practice of Natural Computing 2017.
- [26] Alejandro Díaz-Caro, Mauricio Guillermo, Alexandre Miquel, and Benoît Valiron. 2019. Realizability in the Unitary Sphere. In *2019 34th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*. 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2019.8785834>
- [27] ELLIE D’HONDT and PRAKASH PANANGADEN. 2006. Quantum weakest preconditions. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* 16, 3 (2006), 429–451. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129506005251>
- [28] Mnacho Echenim and Mehdi Mhalla. 2024. A Formalization of the CHSH Inequality and Tsirelson’s Upper-bound in Isabelle/HOL. *Journal of Automated Reasoning* 68, 1 (2024), 2. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-023-09689-9>
- [29] Yuan Feng and Sanjiang Li. 2023. Abstract interpretation, Hoare logic, and incorrectness logic for quantum programs. *Information and Computation* 294 (2023), 105077. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2023.105077>
- [30] Yuan Feng and Mingsheng Ying. 2021. Quantum Hoare Logic with Classical Variables. *ACM Transactions on Quantum Computing* 2, 4, Article 16 (Dec. 2021), 43 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3456877>
- [31] Jürgen Giesl, Peter Schneider-Kamp, and René Thiemann. 2006. AProVE 1.2: Automatic termination proofs in the dependency pair framework. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)* 4130 LNAI (2006), 281–286. [https://doi.org/10.1007/11814771\\_24](https://doi.org/10.1007/11814771_24)
- [32] Nicolas Granger. 1999. *Stability, Simplicity and the Model Theory of Bilinear Forms*. Ph. D. Dissertation. University of Manchester.
- [33] Alexander S Green, Peter LeFanu Lumsdaine, Neil J Ross, DalCa Peter Selinger, and Benoît Valiron. [n. d.]. Quipper: a scalable quantum programming language. *dl.acm.org* ([n. d.]). <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/2491956.2462177>
- [34] Aram W. Harrow, Avinandan Hassidim, and Seth Lloyd. 2009. Quantum Algorithm for Linear Systems of Equations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 103 (Oct 2009), 150502. Issue 15. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.150502>
- [35] Masahito Hasegawa, Martin Hofmann, and Gordon D. Plotkin. 2008. Finite Dimensional Vector Spaces Are Complete for Traced Symmetric Monoidal Categories. In *Pillars of Computer Science, Essays Dedicated to Boris (Boaz) Trakhtenbrot on the Occasion of His 85th Birthday (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 4800)*, Arnon Avron, Nachum Dershowitz, and Alexander Rabinovich (Eds.). Springer, 367–385. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78127-1\\_20](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78127-1_20)
- [36] Kesha Hietala, Sarah Marshall, Robert Rand, and Nikhil Swamy. [n. d.]. Q\*: Implementing Quantum Separation Logic in F. ([n. d.]).
- [37] Kesha Hietala, Robert Rand, Shih-Han Hung, Liyi Li, and Michael Hicks. 2021. Proving Quantum Programs Correct. In *12th International Conference on Interactive Theorem Proving (ITP 2021) (Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), Vol. 193)*, Liron Cohen and Cezary Kaliszyk (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, 21:1–21:19. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ITP.2021.21>
- [38] Kesha Hietala, Robert Rand, Shih-Han Hung, Xiaodi Wu, and Michael Hicks. 2021. A Verified Optimizer for Quantum Circuits. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 5, POPL, Article 37 (jan 2021), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3434318>
- [39] Kesha Hietala, Robert Rand, Shih-Han Hung, Xiaodi Wu, and Michael Hicks. 2021. A verified optimizer for Quantum circuits. 5, POPL, Article 37 (jan 2021), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3434318>
- [40] Xin Hong, Wei-Jia Huang, Wei-Chen Chien, Yuan Feng, Min-Hsiu Hsieh, Sanjiang Li, and Mingsheng Ying. 2024. Equivalence Checking of Paramaterised Quantum Circuits. (2024). arXiv:2404.18456 [quant-ph] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.18456>
- [41] Shih-Han Hung, Kesha Hietala, Shaopeng Zhu, Mingsheng Ying, Michael Hicks, and Xiaodi Wu. 2019. Quantitative robustness analysis of quantum programs. 3, POPL, Article 31 (jan 2019), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290344>
- [42] Emmanuel Jeandel, Simon Perdrix, and Renaud Vilmart. 2018. A Complete Axiomatisation of the ZX-Calculus for Clifford+T Quantum Mechanics. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (Oxford, United Kingdom) (LICS ’18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 559–568. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3209108.3209131>
- [43] Aleks Kissinger and John van de Wetering. 2020. PyZX: Large Scale Automated Diagrammatic Reasoning. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 318 (May 2020), 229–241. <https://doi.org/10.4204/eptcs.318.14>

- [44] Ugo Dal Lago, Andrea Masini, and Margherita Zorzi. 2009. Confluence Results for a Quantum Lambda Calculus with Measurements. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Quantum Physics and Logic, QPL@MFPS 2009, Oxford, UK, April 8-9, 2009 (Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, Vol. 270)*, Bob Coecke, Prakash Panangaden, and Peter Selinger (Eds.). Elsevier, 251–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENTCS.2011.01.035>
- [45] Ugo Dal Lago, Andrea Masini, and Margherita Zorzi. 2009. On a measurement-free quantum lambda calculus with classical control. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.* 19, 2 (2009), 297–335. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S096012950800741X>
- [46] Xuan-Bach Le, Shang-Wei Lin, Jun Sun, and David Sanan. 2022. A Quantum Interpretation of Separating Conjunction for Local Reasoning of Quantum Programs Based on Separation Logic. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 6, POPL, Article 36 (jan 2022), 27 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3498697>
- [47] Adrian Lehmann, Ben Caldwell, and Robert Rand. 2022. VyZX : A Vision for Verifying the ZX Calculus. (2022). arXiv:2205.05781 [quant-ph] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.05781>
- [48] Marco Lewis, Sadegh Soudjani, and Paolo Zuliani. 2023. Formal Verification of Quantum Programs: Theory, Tools, and Challenges. *ACM Transactions on Quantum Computing* 5 (12 2023), Issue 1. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3624483>
- [49] Marco Lewis, Sadegh Soudjani, and Paolo Zuliani. 2023. Formal Verification of Quantum Programs: Theory, Tools, and Challenges. 5, 1, Article 1 (dec 2023), 35 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3624483>
- [50] Liyi Li, Mingwei Zhu, Rance Cleaveland, Alexander Nicoletti, Yi Lee, Le Chang, and Xiaodi Wu. 2024. Qafny: A Quantum-Program Verifier. (2024). arXiv:2211.06411 [quant-ph] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.06411>
- [51] Junyi Liu, Bohua Zhan, Shuling Wang, Shenggang Ying, Tao Liu, Yangjia Li, Mingsheng Ying, and Naijun Zhan. 2019. Formal Verification of Quantum Algorithms Using Quantum Hoare Logic. In *Computer Aided Verification, Isil Dillig and Serdar Tasiran (Eds.)*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 187–207. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25543-5\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25543-5_12)
- [52] Angus Macintyre and Alex J. Wilkie. 1996. On the Decidability of the Real Exponential Field. In *Kreiseliana: About and Around Georg Kreisel*, Piergiorgio Odifreddi (Ed.). A K Peters, 441–467.
- [53] M. H. A. Newman. 1942. On Theories with a Combinatorial Definition of "Equivalence". *Annals of Mathematics* 43, 2 (1942), 223–243. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1968867>
- [54] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. 2010. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511976667>
- [55] Enno Ohlebusch. 2002. *Advanced topics in term rewriting*. Springer Science & Business Media. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-3661-8>
- [56] Jens Palsberg and Nengkun Yu. 2024. Optimal implementation of quantum gates with two controls. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 694 (2024), 206–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2024.03.039>
- [57] Jennifer Paykin, Robert Rand, and Steve Zdancewic. 2017. QWIRE: a core language for quantum circuits. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* 52 (5 2017), 846–858. Issue 1. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3093333.3009894>
- [58] Boldizsár Poór, Quanlong Wang, Razin A. Shaikh, Lia Yeh, Richie Yeung, and Bob Coecke. 2023. Completeness for arbitrary finite dimensions of ZXW-calculus, a unifying calculus. In *2023 38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*. 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS56636.2023.10175672>
- [59] Robert Rand, Jennifer Paykin, and Steve Zdancewic. 2017. QWIRE Practice: Formal Verification of Quantum Circuits in Coq. In *Proceedings 14th International Conference on Quantum Physics and Logic, QPL 2017, Nijmegen, The Netherlands, 3-7 July 2017. (EPTCS, Vol. 266)*, Bob Coecke and Aleks Kissinger (Eds.). 119–132. <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.266.8>
- [60] Rodrigo Raya and Viktor Kuncak. 2024. On algebraic array theories. *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.* 136 (2024), 100906. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JLAMP.2023.100906>
- [61] Peter Selinger. 2008. Finite Dimensional Hilbert Spaces are Complete for Dagger Compact Closed Categories (Extended Abstract). In *Proceedings of the Joint 5th International Workshop on Quantum Physics and Logic and 4th Workshop on Developments in Computational Models, QPL/DCM@ICALP 2008, Reykjavik, Iceland, July 12-13, 2008 (Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, Vol. 270)*, Bob Coecke, Ian Mackie, Prakash Panangaden, and Peter Selinger (Eds.). Elsevier, 113–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENTCS.2011.01.010>
- [62] Kartik Singhal, ROBERT Rand, and MATTHEW Amy. 2022. Beyond separation: Toward a specification language for modular reasoning about quantum programs. *Programming Languages for Quantum Computing (PLanQC) 2022 Poster Abstract* (2022).
- [63] Robert Solovay, R. D. Arthan, and John Harrison. 2012. Some new results on decidability for elementary algebra and geometry. *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.* 163, 12 (2012), 1765–1802. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APAL.2012.04.003>
- [64] Runzhou Tao, Yunong Shi, Jianan Yao, John Hui, Frederic T. Chong, and Ronghui Gu. 2021. Gleipnir: toward practical error analysis for Quantum programs. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (Virtual, Canada) (PLDI 2021)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 48–64. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3453483.3454029>
- [65] Alfred Tarski. 1998. A Decision Method for Elementary Algebra and Geometry. In *Quantifier Elimination and Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition*, Bob F. Caviness and Jeremy R. Johnson (Eds.). Springer Vienna, Vienna, 24–84. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-7091-9459-1\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-7091-9459-1_3)

- [66] The MathComp Analysis Development Team. 2022. MathComp-Analysis: Mathematical Components compliant Analysis Library. <https://github.com/math-comp/analysis>. Since 2017. Version 0.5.1.
- [67] Dominique Unruh. 2019. Quantum Hoare Logic with Ghost Variables. In *2019 34th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*. 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2019.8785779>
- [68] Dominique Unruh. 2019. Quantum Relational Hoare Logic. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 3, POPL, Article 33 (jan 2019), 31 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290346>
- [69] John van de Wetering. 2020. ZX-calculus for the working quantum computer scientist. arXiv:2012.13966 [quant-ph] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.13966>
- [70] Renaud Vilmart. 2023. Completeness of Sum-Over-Paths for Toffoli-Hadamard and the Dyadic Fragments of Quantum Computation. In *31st EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2023, February 13-16, 2023, Warsaw, Poland (LIPIcs, Vol. 252)*, Bartek Klin and Elaine Pimentel (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 36:1–36:17. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.CSL.2023.36>
- [71] Mingsheng Ying. 2012. Floyd–hoare logic for quantum programs. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* 33, 6, Article 19 (Jan. 2012), 49 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2049706.2049708>
- [72] Mingsheng Ying. 2016. *Foundations of quantum programming*. Morgan Kaufmann.
- [73] Nengkun Yu and Jens Palsberg. 2021. Quantum Abstract Interpretation. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (Virtual, Canada) (PLDI 2021)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 542–558. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3453483.3454061>
- [74] Li Zhou, Gilles Barthe, Justin Hsu, Mingsheng Ying, and Nengkun Yu. 2021. A Quantum Interpretation of Bunched Logic & Quantum Separation Logic. In *2021 36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*. 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS52264.2021.9470673>
- [75] Li Zhou, Gilles Barthe, Pierre-Yves Strub, Junyi Liu, and Mingsheng Ying. 2023. CoqQ: Foundational Verification of Quantum Programs. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 7, POPL, Article 29 (jan 2023), 33 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571222>
- [76] Li Zhou, Nengkun Yu, and Mingsheng Ying. 2019. An applied quantum Hoare logic. In *Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (Phoenix, AZ, USA) (PLDI 2019)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1149–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3314221.3314584>

## A Dirac Notation Core Language (Full Details)

This section introduces the Dirac notation core language in full detail, including the dynamic typing technique, all the semantical definitions, axioms, and rewriting rules.

*Definition A.1 (core language of Dirac Notation).* The **core language of Dirac Notation**, denoted as DN, is a many-sorted language with dependent types, defined as follows.

<b>Kinds</b>	(classical kind)	$P ::= \text{Atom} \mid P * P,$
	(quantum kind)	$D ::= \text{Scalar} \mid \text{Ket} \mid \text{Bra} \mid \text{Operator},$
<b>Types</b>	(classical types)	$\sigma ::= x \mid A \mid \sigma \times \sigma \mid \pi_1(\sigma) \mid \pi_2(\sigma) \mid \pi_K(T) \mid \pi_B(T) \mid \text{type}(t),$
	(quantum types)	$T ::= x \mid S \mid \mathcal{K}(\sigma) \mid \mathcal{B}(\sigma) \mid O(\sigma, \sigma)$ $\mid \text{type}(S) \mid \text{type}(K) \mid \text{type}(B) \mid \text{type}(O),$
<b>Terms</b>	(basis)	$t ::= x \mid b \mid (t, t),$
	(scalar)	$a ::= x \mid 0 \mid 1 \mid \delta_{t,t} \mid a + a \mid a \times a \mid a^* \mid B \cdot K,$
	(ket)	$K ::= x \mid \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma) \mid  t\rangle \mid B^\dagger \mid S.K \mid K + K \mid O \cdot K \mid K \otimes K,$
	(bra)	$B ::= x \mid \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{B}}(\sigma) \mid \langle t  \mid K^\dagger \mid S.B \mid B + B \mid B \cdot O \mid B \otimes B,$
	(operator)	$O ::= x \mid \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \sigma) \mid \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma) \mid K \cdot B \mid O^\dagger \mid S.O \mid O + O \mid O \cdot O \mid O \otimes O.$

We use  $x$  for variables,  $A$  for atomic type constants, and  $b$  for basis constants. We use Greek letters like  $\sigma, \tau, \rho$  for classical types and letters like  $T$  for quantum types. We use lowercase letters like  $s, t$  for basis and  $a, b, c$  for scalars. We use letters  $S, K, B, O$  and their variants to represent terms from the scalar, ket, bra, and operator sorts respectively.

### A.1 Context and Typing

*Definition A.2 (context).* A **typing assumption** is written as  $x : X$ , meaning that variable  $x$  is of type  $X$ . A **context**  $\Gamma$  is an ordered list of typing assumptions. We write  $x : X \in \Gamma$  if the typing assumption is contained in context  $\Gamma$ , and  $x \in \Gamma$  if there exists a typing assumption of  $x$  contained in  $\Gamma$ .

We define simultaneously two judgement. One is  $\mathcal{WF}(\Gamma)$ , meaning that a context is **well-formed**. And the second one is a **typing judgement** written as  $\Gamma \vdash e : X$ , indicating that  $e$  is an expression of type  $X$  in context  $\Gamma$ . We say the term  $e$  is a **well-typed** term in context  $\Gamma$  if  $\Gamma \vdash e : X$  is a typing judgement for some  $X$ .

Well-formed contexts can be constructed starting with an empty context, and continuously appending unique variables with proven typing judgements.

(WELL-FORMED CONTEXT)

$$\frac{}{\mathcal{WF}(\emptyset)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash T : X \quad x \notin \Gamma}{\mathcal{WF}(\Gamma :: (x : T))}$$

The typing judgements can be proved by the typing rules in the below.

(CONTEXT)

$$\frac{\mathcal{WF}(\Gamma) \quad x : \sigma \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : \sigma}$$

(BASIS TYPE)

$$\frac{\mathcal{WF}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash A : \text{Atom}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \sigma_1 : P_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash \sigma_2 : P_2}{\Gamma \vdash \sigma_1 \times \sigma_2 : P_1 * P_2} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \sigma : P_1 * P_2}{\Gamma \vdash \pi_1(\sigma) : P_1} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \sigma : P_1 * P_2}{\Gamma \vdash \pi_2(\sigma) : P_2}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash T : \mathcal{K}(\sigma)}{\Gamma \vdash \pi_{\mathcal{K}}(T) : P} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash T : \mathcal{B}(\sigma)}{\Gamma \vdash \pi_{\mathcal{B}}(T) : P} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \text{type}(t) : P}$$

(DIRAC TYPE)

$$\frac{\mathcal{WF}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash \mathcal{S} : \text{Scalar}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \sigma : P}{\Gamma \vdash \mathcal{K}(\sigma) : \text{Ket}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \sigma : P}{\Gamma \vdash \mathcal{B}(\sigma) : \text{Bra}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \sigma_1 : P_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash \sigma_2 : P_2}{\Gamma \vdash \mathcal{O}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) : \text{Operator}}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathcal{S} : \mathcal{S}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{type}(\mathcal{S}) : \text{Scalar}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\sigma)}{\Gamma \vdash \text{type}(K) : \text{Ket}}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\sigma)}{\Gamma \vdash \text{type}(B) : \text{Bra}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash O : \mathcal{O}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)}{\Gamma \vdash \text{type}(O) : \text{Operator}}$$

(BASIS)

$$\frac{\mathcal{WF}(\Gamma) \quad b \text{ is an atomic basis of } A}{\Gamma \vdash b : A} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash t : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash (s, t) : \tau \times \sigma}$$

(COMPLEX SCALAR)

$$\frac{\mathcal{WF}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash 0 : \mathcal{S}} \quad \frac{\mathcal{WF}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash 1 : \mathcal{S}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : \sigma \quad \Gamma \vdash t : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \delta_{s,t} : \mathcal{S}}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash a : \mathcal{S} \quad \Gamma \vdash b : \mathcal{S}}{\Gamma \vdash a + b : \mathcal{S}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash a : \mathcal{S} \quad \Gamma \vdash b : \mathcal{S}}{\Gamma \vdash a \times b : \mathcal{S}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash a : \mathcal{S}}{\Gamma \vdash a^* : \mathcal{S}}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash B \cdot K : \mathcal{S}}$$

(KET)

$$\frac{\mathcal{WF}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}(\tau)} : \mathcal{K}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash |t\rangle : \mathcal{K}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash K^\dagger : \mathcal{B}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash a : \mathcal{S} \quad \Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash a.K : \mathcal{K}(\tau)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash K_1 : \mathcal{K}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash K_2 : \mathcal{K}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash K_1 + K_2 : \mathcal{K}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash O : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho) \quad \Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\rho)}{\Gamma \vdash O \cdot K : \mathcal{K}(\tau)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash K_1 : \mathcal{K}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash K_2 : \mathcal{K}(\rho)}{\Gamma \vdash K_1 \otimes K_2 : \mathcal{K}(\tau \times \rho)}$$

(BRA)

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\mathcal{WF}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{B}}(\tau) : \mathcal{B}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \langle t | : \mathcal{B}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash B^\dagger : \mathcal{K}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash a : \mathcal{S} \quad \Gamma \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash a.B : \mathcal{B}(\tau)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash B_1 : \mathcal{B}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash B_2 : \mathcal{B}(\tau)}{\Gamma \vdash B_1 + B_2 : \mathcal{B}(\tau)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash O : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)}{\Gamma \vdash B \cdot O : \mathcal{B}(\rho)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash B_1 : \mathcal{B}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash B_2 : \mathcal{B}(\rho)}{\Gamma \vdash B_1 \otimes B_2 : \mathcal{B}(\tau \times \rho)}
\end{array}$$

(OPERATOR)

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\mathcal{WF}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{O}}(\tau, \rho) : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)} \quad \frac{\mathcal{WF}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}}(\tau) : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \tau)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash K : \mathcal{K}(\tau) \quad \Gamma \vdash B : \mathcal{B}(\rho)}{\Gamma \vdash K \cdot B : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash O : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)}{\Gamma \vdash O^\dagger : \mathcal{O}(\rho, \tau)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash a : \mathcal{S} \quad \Gamma \vdash O : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)}{\Gamma \vdash a.O : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash O_1 : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho) \quad \Gamma \vdash O_2 : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)}{\Gamma \vdash O_1 + O_2 : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash O_1 : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \rho) \quad \Gamma \vdash O_2 : \mathcal{O}(\rho, \sigma)}{\Gamma \vdash O_1 \cdot O_2 : \mathcal{O}(\tau, \sigma)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash O_1 : \mathcal{O}(\tau_1, \rho_1) \quad \Gamma \vdash O_2 : \mathcal{O}(\tau_2, \rho_2)}{\Gamma \vdash O_1 \otimes O_2 : \mathcal{O}(\tau_1 \times \tau_2, \rho_1 \times \rho_2)}
\end{array}$$

## A.2 Denotational Semantics

*Definition A.3 (semantics of kinds).* The semantics of kinds are defined as sets of domains as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\llbracket \text{Atom} \rrbracket \equiv \mathcal{A}, & \llbracket P_1 * P_2 \rrbracket \equiv \{S_1 \times S_2 : S_1 \in \llbracket P_1 \rrbracket, S_2 \in \llbracket P_2 \rrbracket\}, \\
\llbracket \text{Scalar} \rrbracket \equiv \{\mathbb{C}\}, & \llbracket \text{Ket} \rrbracket \equiv \{\mathcal{H}_{[P]} : P \text{ is a basis kind}\}, \\
\llbracket \text{Bra} \rrbracket \equiv \{\mathcal{H}_{[P]}^* : P \text{ is a basis kind}\}, & \llbracket \text{Operator} \rrbracket \equiv \{\mathcal{L}(H_1, H_2) : H_1, H_2 \in \llbracket \text{Ket} \rrbracket\}.
\end{array}$$

Basis types and Dirac types as terms have their types in kinds. The semantics of types are defined as domains and should be contained in the semantics of kinds. Therefore, kinds are interpreted as sets of domains. Atom is interpreted as the set  $\mathcal{A}$  of all different domains from the atomic classical types, and the kind  $P_1 * P_2$  contains all different Cartesian products from  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . The semantics of Ket, Bra and Operator are defined as the set of all Hilbert spaces, dual spaces and linear operators, respectively.



*Definition A.4 (semantics of types).* The semantics of basis types are defined as domain sets as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket A \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket A \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}, & \llbracket \sigma_1 \times \sigma_2 \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket \sigma_1 \rrbracket \times \llbracket \sigma_2 \rrbracket, \\
\llbracket \pi_1(\sigma) \rrbracket &\equiv S_1 \quad (\text{where } \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket = S_1 \times S_2), & \llbracket \pi_2(\sigma) \rrbracket &\equiv S_2 \quad (\text{where } \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket = S_1 \times S_2), \\
\llbracket \pi_K(T) \rrbracket &\equiv S, \quad (\text{where } \llbracket T \rrbracket = \mathcal{H}_S), & \llbracket \pi_B(T) \rrbracket &\equiv S, \quad (\text{where } \llbracket T \rrbracket = \mathcal{H}_S^*), \\
\llbracket S \rrbracket &\equiv \mathbb{C}, & \llbracket \mathcal{K}(\sigma) \rrbracket &\equiv \mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}, & \llbracket \mathcal{B}(\sigma) \rrbracket &\equiv \mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}^*, & \llbracket \mathcal{O}(\sigma, \tau) \rrbracket &\equiv \mathcal{L}(\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket, \llbracket \tau \rrbracket), \\
\llbracket \text{type}(t) \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket T \rrbracket \quad (\text{where } \Gamma \vdash t : T).
\end{aligned}$$

Because we only consider well-typed terms, the semantics are always well-defined.

*Definition A.5 (semantics of basis).* For atomic basis with domain  $A$ , the domain for bases is the binary tree algebra over  $A$ , which is defined as  $\mu X.(A \cup (X \times X))$ , the smallest set that contains  $A$  and is closed under the Cartesian product.

The semantics of symbols in basis sort are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{Atomic Basis}) & & \llbracket b \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket b \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}, \\
(\text{Pairing}) & & \llbracket (t_1, t_2) \rrbracket &\equiv (\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket, \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket).
\end{aligned}$$

*Definition A.6 (semantics of scalar).* The domain for scalars is the complex field  $\mathbb{C}$ . The semantics of the symbols are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{Constant } 0) & & \llbracket 0 \rrbracket &\equiv 0, \\
(\text{Constant } 1) & & \llbracket 1 \rrbracket &\equiv 1, \\
(\text{Kronecker Delta}) & & \llbracket \delta_{s,t} \rrbracket &\equiv \begin{cases} 1, & \text{where } \llbracket s \rrbracket = \llbracket t \rrbracket, \\ 0, & \text{where } \llbracket s \rrbracket \neq \llbracket t \rrbracket, \end{cases} \\
(\text{Addition}) & & \llbracket a + b \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket a \rrbracket + \llbracket b \rrbracket, \\
(\text{Multiplication}) & & \llbracket a \times b \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket a \rrbracket \times \llbracket b \rrbracket, \\
(\text{Conjugate}) & & \llbracket a^* \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket a \rrbracket^*, \\
(\text{Inner Product}) & & \llbracket B \cdot K \rrbracket &\equiv \langle \llbracket B \rrbracket^*, \llbracket K \rrbracket \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

*Definition A.7 (semantics of ket/bra).* The domain for the semantics of ket in  $\mathcal{K}(\sigma)$  and bra in  $\mathcal{B}(\sigma)$  are  $\mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}^*$  respectively. The symbols are explained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{Zero Vector}) & & \llbracket \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma) \rrbracket &\equiv \mathbf{0} & \llbracket \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{B}}(\sigma) \rrbracket &\equiv \mathbf{0}^*, \\
(\text{Basis Vector}) & & \llbracket |t\rangle \rrbracket &\equiv | \llbracket t \rrbracket \rangle & \llbracket \langle t| \rrbracket &\equiv \langle \llbracket t \rrbracket |, \\
(\text{Adjoint}) & & \llbracket B^\dagger \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket B \rrbracket^* & \llbracket K^\dagger \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket K \rrbracket^*, \\
(\text{Scalar Multiplication}) & & \llbracket a.K \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket K \rrbracket & \llbracket a.B \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket a \rrbracket \llbracket B \rrbracket, \\
(\text{Addition}) & & \llbracket K_1 + K_2 \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket K_1 \rrbracket + \llbracket K_2 \rrbracket & \llbracket B_1 + B_2 \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket B_1 \rrbracket + \llbracket B_2 \rrbracket, \\
(\text{Linear Operator}) & & \llbracket O \cdot K \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket O \rrbracket \cdot \llbracket K \rrbracket & \llbracket B \cdot O \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket B \rrbracket \cdot \llbracket O \rrbracket, \\
(\text{Tensor Product}) & & \llbracket K_1 \otimes K_2 \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket K_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket K_2 \rrbracket & \llbracket B_1 \otimes B_2 \rrbracket &\equiv \llbracket B_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket B_2 \rrbracket.
\end{aligned}$$

*Definition A.8 (semantics of operator).* The domain for the semantics of operators in  $\mathcal{O}(\sigma, \tau)$  is the linear operators in  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket}, \mathcal{H}_{\llbracket \tau \rrbracket})$ . The symbols are explained as follows:

(Zero Operator)	$\llbracket \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) \rrbracket \equiv \mathbf{0}_{\text{op}},$
(Identity Operator)	$\llbracket \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma) \rrbracket \equiv \mathbf{I},$
(Outer Product)	$\llbracket K \cdot B \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket K \rrbracket \cdot \llbracket B \rrbracket,$
(Adjoint)	$\llbracket O^\dagger \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket O \rrbracket^\dagger,$
(Scalar Operator)	$\llbracket S.O \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket S \rrbracket \llbracket O \rrbracket,$
(Addition)	$\llbracket O_1 + O_2 \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket O_1 \rrbracket + \llbracket O_2 \rrbracket,$
(Operator Multiplication)	$\llbracket O_1 \cdot O_2 \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket O_1 \rrbracket \cdot \llbracket O_2 \rrbracket,$
(Tensor Product)	$\llbracket O_1 \otimes O_2 \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket O_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket O_2 \rrbracket,$

## B Dirac Core Language Rewriting System (Full Details)

*Definition B.1 (TRS  $R_{\text{DN}}$ ).* The TRS  $R_{\text{DN}}$  consists of all rewriting rules in this section. The AC symbols are + for all sorts and  $\times$ , while the commutative only symbol is  $\delta$ .

The symbol type for dynamic typing depends on the context  $\Gamma$ , and  $\text{type}(\Gamma, x)$  is simplified into  $\text{type}(x)$  in most rules.

(TYPE-SIMP)

$$\text{type}(\Gamma, x) \triangleright \Gamma(x) \text{ (for variable } x)$$

$$\pi_K(\mathcal{K}(\sigma)) \triangleright \sigma \quad \pi_B(\mathcal{B}(\sigma)) \triangleright \sigma \quad \pi_1(\sigma \times \tau) \triangleright \sigma \quad \pi_2(\sigma \times \tau) \triangleright \tau$$

(TYPE-BASIS)

$$\text{type}((s, t)) \triangleright \text{type}(s) \times \text{type}(t)$$

(TYPE-SCALAR)

$$\text{type}(0) \triangleright \mathcal{S} \quad \text{type}(1) \triangleright \mathcal{S} \quad \text{type}(a + b) \triangleright \mathcal{S} \quad \text{type}(a \times b) \triangleright \mathcal{S}$$

$$\text{type}(a^*) \triangleright \mathcal{S} \quad \text{type}(\delta_{s,t}) \triangleright \mathcal{S} \quad \text{type}(B \cdot K) \triangleright \mathcal{S}$$

(TYPE-KET)

$$\text{type}(\mathbf{0}_K(\sigma)) \triangleright \mathcal{K}(\sigma) \quad \text{type}(|s\rangle) \triangleright \mathcal{K}(\text{type}(s)) \quad \text{type}(B^\dagger) \triangleright \mathcal{K}(\pi_B(\text{type}(B)))$$

$$\text{type}(a.K) \triangleright \text{type}(K) \quad \text{type}(K_1 + K_2) \triangleright \text{type}(K_1) \quad \text{type}(O \cdot K) \triangleright \mathcal{K}(\pi_K(\text{type}(O)))$$

$$\text{type}(K_1 \otimes K_2) \triangleright \mathcal{K}(\pi_K(\text{type}(K_1)) \times \pi_K(\text{type}(K_2)))$$

(TYPE-BRA)

$$\text{type}(\mathbf{0}_B(\sigma)) \triangleright \mathcal{B}(T) \quad \text{type}(\langle s|) \triangleright \mathcal{B}(\text{type}(s)) \quad \text{type}(K^\dagger) \triangleright \mathcal{B}(\pi_K(\text{type}(K)))$$

$$\text{type}(a.B) \triangleright \text{type}(B) \quad \text{type}(B_1 + B_2) \triangleright \text{type}(B_1) \quad \text{type}(B \cdot O) \triangleright \mathcal{B}(\pi_B(\text{type}(O)))$$

$$\text{type}(B_1 \otimes B_2) \triangleright \mathcal{B}(\pi_B(\text{type}(B)) \times \pi_B(\text{type}(B)))$$

(TYPE-OP)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{type}(\mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau)) \triangleright O(\sigma, \tau) & \text{type}(\mathbf{1}_O(\sigma)) \triangleright O(\sigma, \sigma) \\
& \text{type}(K \cdot B) \triangleright O(\pi_K(\text{type}(K)), \pi_B(\text{type}(B))) \\
& \text{type}(O^\dagger) \triangleright O(\pi_B(\text{type}(O)), \pi_K(\text{type}(O))) \\
& \text{type}(a.O) \triangleright \text{type}(O) & \text{type}(O_1 + O_2) \triangleright \text{type}(O_1) \\
& \text{type}(O_1 \cdot O_2) \triangleright O(\pi_K(\text{type}(O_1)), \pi_B(\text{type}(O_2))) \\
& \text{type}(O_1 \otimes O_2) \triangleright O(\pi_K(\text{type}(O_1)) \times \pi_K(\text{type}(O_2)), \pi_B(\text{type}(O_1)) \times \pi_B(\text{type}(O_2)))
\end{aligned}$$

The rewriting rules above are for type calculation. Note that these rules do not enforce type checkings and should only operate on well-typed expressions.

(R-SCALAR)

$$0 + a \triangleright a \quad 0 \times a \triangleright 0 \quad 1 \times a \triangleright a \quad a \times (b + c) \triangleright a \times b + a \times c$$

(R-S-DELTA)

$$\delta s, s \triangleright 1 \quad \delta_{(s_1, s_2), (t_1, t_2)} \triangleright \delta_{s_1, t_1} \times \delta_{s_2, t_2}$$

(R-KET-SCR)

$$\begin{aligned}
& 0.K \triangleright \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\pi_K(\text{type}(K))) & 1.K \triangleright K & a.\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma) \triangleright \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma) \\
& a.(b.K) \triangleright (a \times b).K & a.(K_1 + K_2) \triangleright a.K_1 + a.K_2
\end{aligned}$$

**Remark:** The first rule reduces scalar multiplication by zero to the zero ket. The type notation of  $\mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}$  is calculated from the type of  $K$ .

(R-KET-ADD)

$$K + \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma) \triangleright K \quad K + K \triangleright (1 + 1).K \quad a.K + K \triangleright (a + 1).K \quad a.K + b.K \triangleright (a + b).K$$

**Remark:** The rules (R-BRA-ADD) and (R-BRA-SCR) for bra are defined similarly.

(R-OP-SCR)

$$\begin{aligned}
& 0.O \triangleright \mathbf{0}_O(\pi_K(\text{type}(O)), \pi_B(\text{type}(O))) & 1.O \triangleright O & a.\mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) \triangleright \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) \\
& a.(b.O) \triangleright (a \times b).O & a.(O_1 + O_2) \triangleright a.O_1 + a.O_2
\end{aligned}$$

(R-OP-ADD)

$$O + \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) \triangleright O \quad O + O \triangleright (1 + 1).O \quad a.O + O \triangleright (a + 1).O \quad a.O + b.O \triangleright (a + b).O$$

(R-KET-TSR)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma) \otimes K \triangleright \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma \times \pi_K(\text{type}(K))) & K \otimes \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma) \triangleright \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\pi_K(\text{type}(K)) \times \sigma) \\
& |s\rangle \otimes |t\rangle \triangleright |(s, t)\rangle & (a.K_1) \otimes K_2 \triangleright a.(K_1 \otimes K_2) & K_1 \otimes (a.K_2) \triangleright a.(K_1 \otimes K_2) \\
& (K_1 + K_2) \otimes K_3 \triangleright K_1 \otimes K_3 + K_2 \otimes K_3 & K_1 \otimes (K_2 + K_3) \triangleright K_1 \otimes K_2 + K_1 \otimes K_3
\end{aligned}$$

**Remark:** The rules (R-BRA-TSR) for bra are defined similarly.

(R-OP-OUTER)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma) \otimes B &\triangleright \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \pi_B(\text{type}(B))) & K \otimes \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{B}}(\sigma) &\triangleright \mathbf{0}_O(\pi_K(\text{type}(K)), \sigma) \\ (a.K) \otimes B &\triangleright a.(K \cdot B) & K \otimes (a.B) &\triangleright a.(K \cdot B) \\ (K_1 + K_2) \otimes B &\triangleright K_1 \cdot B + K_2 \cdot B & K \otimes (B_1 + B_2) &\triangleright K \cdot B_1 + K \cdot B_2 \end{aligned}$$

(R-OP-TSR)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) \otimes O &\triangleright \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma \times \pi_K(\text{type}(O)), \tau \times \pi_B(\text{type}(O))) \\ O \otimes \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) &\triangleright \mathbf{0}_O(\pi_K(\text{type}(O)) \times \sigma, \pi_B(\text{type}(O)) \times \tau) \\ \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma) \otimes \mathbf{1}_O(\tau) &\triangleright \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma \times \tau) \\ (K_1 \cdot B_1) \otimes (K_2 \cdot B_2) &\triangleright (K_1 \otimes K_2) \otimes (B_1 \otimes B_2) \\ (a.O_1) \otimes O_2 &\triangleright a.(O_1 \otimes O_2) & O_1 \otimes (a.O_2) &\triangleright a.(O_1 \otimes O_2) \\ (O_1 + O_2) \otimes O_3 &\triangleright O_1 \otimes O_3 + O_2 \otimes O_3 & O_1 \otimes (O_2 + O_3) &\triangleright O_1 \otimes O_2 + O_1 \otimes O_3 \end{aligned}$$

(R-S-CONJ)

$$\begin{aligned} 0^* &\triangleright 0 & 1^* &\triangleright 1 \\ (a + b)^* &\triangleright a^* + b^* & (a \times b)^* &\triangleright a^* \times b^* & (a^*)^* &\triangleright a \\ \delta_{s,t}^* &\triangleright \delta_{s,t} & (B \cdot K)^* &\triangleright K^\dagger \cdot B^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

(R-S-DOT)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{B}}(\sigma) \cdot K &\triangleright 0 & B \cdot \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma) &\triangleright 0 & (a.B) \cdot K &\triangleright a \times (B \cdot K) & B \cdot (a.K) &\triangleright a \times (B \cdot K) \\ (B_1 + B_2) \cdot K &\triangleright B_1 \cdot K + B_2 \cdot K & B \cdot (K_1 + K_2) &\triangleright B \cdot K_1 + B \cdot K_2 & \langle s | \cdot | t \rangle &\triangleright \delta_{s,t} \\ (B_1 \otimes B_2) \cdot |(s, t)\rangle &\triangleright (B_1 \cdot |s\rangle) \times (B_2 \cdot |t\rangle) & \langle (s, t) | \cdot (K_1 \otimes K_2) &\triangleright (\langle s | \cdot K_1) \times (\langle t | \cdot K_2) \\ (B_1 \otimes B_2) \cdot (K_1 \otimes K_2) &\triangleright (B_1 \cdot K_1) \times (B_2 \cdot K_2) \end{aligned}$$

**Remark:** The difficulty here comes from Hilbert space structure. The intuition is that we decompose the multiplication (inner product) when at least one side is explicitly in tensor product form.

(R-S-SORT)

$$\begin{aligned} (B \cdot O) \cdot K &\triangleright B \cdot (O \cdot K) \\ \langle (s, t) | \cdot ((O_1 \otimes O_2) \cdot K) &\triangleright ((\langle s | \cdot O_1) \otimes (\langle t | \cdot O_2)) \cdot K \\ (B_1 \otimes B_2) \cdot ((O_1 \otimes O_2) \cdot K) &\triangleright ((B_1 \cdot O_1) \otimes (B_2 \cdot O_2)) \cdot K \end{aligned}$$

**Remark:** The first rule sorts the multiplication to the right, which breaks the symmetry of ket and bra. The remaining two rules are for completion.

(R-KET-ADJ)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0}_B(\sigma)^\dagger \triangleright \mathbf{0}_K(\sigma) \quad \langle t |^\dagger \triangleright |t\rangle \quad (K^\dagger)^\dagger \triangleright K \quad (a.B)^\dagger \triangleright a^*. (B^\dagger) \\ (B_1 + B_2)^\dagger \triangleright B_1^\dagger + B_2^\dagger \quad (B \cdot O)^\dagger \triangleright O^\dagger \cdot B^\dagger \quad (B_1 \otimes B_2)^\dagger \triangleright B_1^\dagger \otimes B_2^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

(R-KET-MLT)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) \cdot K \triangleright \mathbf{0}_K(\sigma) \quad O \cdot \mathbf{0}_K(\sigma) \triangleright \mathbf{0}_K(\pi_K(\text{type}(O))) \quad \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma) \cdot K \triangleright K \\ (a.O) \cdot K \triangleright a.(O \cdot K) \quad O \cdot (a.K) \triangleright a.(O \cdot K) \\ (O_1 + O_2) \cdot K \triangleright O_1 \cdot K + O_2 \cdot K \quad O \cdot (K_1 + K_2) \triangleright O \cdot K_1 + O \cdot K_2 \\ (K_1 \cdot B) \cdot K_2 \triangleright (B \cdot K_2).K_1 \quad (O_1 \cdot O_2) \cdot K \triangleright O_1 \cdot (O_2 \cdot K) \\ (O_1 \otimes O_2) \cdot ((O'_1 \otimes O'_2) \cdot K) \triangleright ((O_1 \cdot O'_1) \otimes (O_2 \cdot O'_2)) \cdot K \\ (O_1 \otimes O_2) \cdot |(s, t)\rangle \triangleright (O_1 \cdot |s\rangle) \otimes (O_2 \cdot |t\rangle) \\ (O_1 \otimes O_2) \cdot (K_1 \otimes K_2) \triangleright (O_1 \cdot K_1) \otimes (O_2 \cdot K_2) \end{aligned}$$

**Remark:** The rules (R-BRA-ADJ) and (R-BRA-MLT) for bra are similar.**Remark:** Again, the difficulty comes from space structure. The intuition for reductions is also the same: decompose the multiplication when at least one side is explicitly in tensor product form.

(R-OP-ADJ)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau)^\dagger \triangleright \mathbf{0}_O(\tau, \sigma) \quad \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma)^\dagger \triangleright \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma) \quad (K \cdot B)^\dagger \triangleright B^\dagger \otimes K^\dagger \quad (O^\dagger)^\dagger \triangleright O \\ (a.O)^\dagger \triangleright a^*. (O^\dagger) \quad (O_1 + O_2)^\dagger \triangleright O_1^\dagger + O_2^\dagger \\ (O_1 \cdot O_2)^\dagger \triangleright O_2^\dagger \cdot O_1^\dagger \quad (O_1 \otimes O_2)^\dagger \triangleright O_1^\dagger \otimes O_2^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

(R-OP-MLT)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) \cdot O \triangleright \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \pi_B(\text{type}(O))) \quad O \cdot \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) \triangleright \mathbf{0}_O(\pi_K(\text{type}(O)), \tau) \\ \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma) \cdot O \triangleright O \quad O \cdot \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma) \triangleright O \\ (K \cdot B) \cdot O \triangleright K \otimes (B \cdot O) \quad O \cdot (K \cdot B) \triangleright (O \cdot K) \otimes B \\ (a.O_1) \cdot O_2 \triangleright a.(O_1 \cdot O_2) \quad O_1 \cdot (a.O_2) \triangleright a.(O_1 \cdot O_2) \\ (O_1 + O_2) \cdot O_3 \triangleright O_1 \cdot O_3 + O_2 \cdot O_3 \quad O_1 \cdot (O_2 + O_3) \triangleright O_1 \cdot O_2 + O_1 \cdot O_3 \\ (O_1 \cdot O_2) \cdot O_3 \triangleright O_1 \cdot (O_2 \cdot O_3) \\ (O_1 \otimes O_2) \cdot (O'_1 \otimes O'_2) \triangleright (O_1 \cdot O'_1) \otimes (O_2 \cdot O'_2) \\ (O_1 \otimes O_2) \cdot ((O'_1 \otimes O'_2) \cdot O_3) \triangleright ((O_1 \cdot O'_1) \otimes (O_2 \cdot O'_2)) \cdot O_3 \end{aligned}$$

## C Confluence and Termination of $R_{DN}$

In this section, we prove the confluence and termination of  $R_{DN}$ . These two properties suggest the syntactical completeness of our language, meaning that all terms will be rewritten into the unique normal form after finite steps by  $R_{DN}$ .

Confluence is an important property for term-rewriting systems. It guarantees the determinism of the calculation: the calculation is independent of the order of rewriting rules applications, and the result is always the same (for terminating TRS) or joinable (for nonterminating ones).

*Definition C.1.* Let relation  $A \rightarrow A$  be a relation.

- It is *confluent* if for all  $a, b, c$  satisfying  $b \leftarrow^* a \rightarrow^* c$ , there exists  $d$  satisfying  $b \rightarrow^* d \leftarrow^* c$ .
- It is *locally confluent* if for all  $a, b, c$  satisfying  $b \leftarrow a \rightarrow c$ , there exists  $d$  satisfying  $b \rightarrow^* d \leftarrow^* c$ .
- It is *terminating* if there does not exist infinite chain  $a_1 \rightarrow a_2 \rightarrow \dots$ .

Since our rewriting system relies on the typing information, which are side-conditions not directly encoded, we will introduce the untyped auxiliary rewriting system  $R'_{DN}$ .

*Definition C.2 (type erasure).* The transformation of type erasure removes all type occurrences under  $\mathbf{0}_K(\sigma)$ ,  $\mathbf{0}_B(\sigma)$ ,  $\mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau)$  and  $\mathbf{1}_O(\sigma)$  symbols, replacing them with constants  $\mathbf{0}_K$ ,  $\mathbf{0}_B$ ,  $\mathbf{0}_O$  and  $\mathbf{1}_O$ . The unique type erasure result of  $t$  is denoted as  $t'$ .

*Definition C.3 (untyped auxiliary TRS).* The untyped auxiliary TRS  $R'_{DN}$  consists of all rules from  $R_{DN}$  after type erasure, i.e.,  $R'_{DN} = \{l' \triangleright r' \mid l \triangleright r \in R_{DN}\}$ .

In the following, we first prove the confluence and termination of  $R'_{DN}$  using the automated tools.

LEMMA C.4. *The system  $R'_{DN}$  is terminating and confluent.*

PROOF. We use APROVE to prove that  $R'_{DN}$  is terminating. We encode  $R'_{DN}$  in CiME2 and checked that all critical pairs are joinable, meaning that it is locally confluent. Then, the termination of  $R'_{DN}$  leads to the confluence of  $R'_{DN}$ .  $\square$

In the next step, we first prove several lemma revealing the close relation between the typed  $R_{DN}$  and untyped  $R'_{DN}$ , then deduce the termination and confluence of  $R_{DN}$  from  $R'_{DN}$ .

LEMMA C.5. *For all  $A$  and  $B$ ,  $A \rightarrow^{R_{DN}} B$  implies  $A' \rightarrow^{R'_{DN}} B'$ .*

PROOF. If the rule  $l \triangleright r$  rewrites  $A$  to  $B$  at position  $p$ , then the type erased rule  $l' \triangleright r'$  can match the subterm at  $p$  and rewrites it into  $B'$ .  $\square$

LEMMA C.6. *For all  $X$  and  $Y$ ,  $X' \rightarrow^{R'_{DN}} Y$  implies there exists  $Z$  satisfying  $X \rightarrow^{R_{DN}} Z$  and  $Z' = Y$ .*

PROOF. If the rule  $l' \triangleright r'$  rewrites  $X'$  to  $Y$  at position  $p$ , then the original rule  $l \triangleright r$  can match the subterm at  $p$  and rewrites it into  $Z$ .  $\square$

LEMMA C.7. *For all  $R'_{DN}$  normal form  $Y$  and type  $T$ , there exists at most one term  $X$  satisfying  $\text{type}(X) = T$  and  $X' = Y$ .*

PROOF. We prove that the types of all subterms in  $X$  can be recovered from  $T$ . Notice that only the typing rules for compositions (e.g.,  $O \cdot K$ ,  $B \cdot K$ ) cannot fully decide the types of subterms from that of the root. But  $\mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{1}_O$  symbols will not appear as operands of compositions in the normal form, since all such patterns will be further rewritten. Therefore all the type notations for  $\mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{1}_O$  are unique, and so is the term  $X$ .  $\square$

THEOREM C.8.  *$R_{DN}$  is terminating.*

PROOF. Assume there is an infinite rewrite sequence  $A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \rightarrow \dots$  by  $R_{DN}$ . By successively applying Lemma C.5, we construct an infinite rewrite sequence  $A'_1 \rightarrow A'_2 \rightarrow \dots$  in  $R'_{DN}$ , contradicting to the termination of  $R'_{DN}$ . Therefore  $R_{DN}$  is also terminating.  $\square$

THEOREM C.9.  *$R_{DN}$  is confluent on well-typed terms.*




Fig. 14. An illustration of Theorem C.9 proof. Solid, dashed and dotted lines represent rewritings in  $R_{\text{DN}}$ ,  $R'_{\text{DN}}$  and the type erasure respectively. Blue, red, yellow and green surfaces represent the application of Lemma C.5, Lemma C.6, Lemma C.4 and Lemma C.7 respectively.

PROOF. See Figure 14. Assume we have  $Y_1 \leftarrow^{R_{\text{DN}}} X \rightarrow^{R_{\text{DN}}} Y_2$  for some well-typed terms  $X$ ,  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$ , we want to prove that there exists  $Z$  such that  $Y_1 \rightarrow^{R_{\text{DN}}} Z \leftarrow^{R_{\text{DN}}} Y_2$ . By Lemma C.5, we have  $Y'_1 \leftarrow^{R'_{\text{DN}}} X' \rightarrow^{R'_{\text{DN}}} Y'_2$ . Since  $R'_{\text{DN}}$  is terminating and confluent, there exists the normal form  $W$  such that  $Y'_1 \rightarrow^{R'_{\text{DN}}} W \leftarrow^{R'_{\text{DN}}} Y'_2$ . Then by successively applying Lemma C.6, we obtain  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  satisfying that  $Y_1 \rightarrow^{R_{\text{DN}}} Z_1$ ,  $Y_2 \rightarrow^{R_{\text{DN}}} Z_2$  and  $Z'_1 = W = Z'_2$ . Since the rewritings of  $R_{\text{DN}}$  preserve the types,  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  will have the same type as  $X$ . Then, by Lemma C.7,  $Z_1 = Z_2$ , which finishes the confluence proof.  $\square$

## D Completeness of $R_{\text{DN}}$

Completeness of the rewriting system means that terms with equivalent denotational semantics will have the same normal form after rewritings.

*Definition D.1 (Semantical completeness of  $R_{\text{DN}}$ ).* We say the TRS  $R_{\text{DN}}$  is *semantically complete* if for all terms  $e_1, e_2$  in DN,  $\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket$  implies  $e_1 \downarrow_{R_{\text{DN}}} = e_2 \downarrow_{R_{\text{DN}}}$ .

Notice that there is another concept called *syntactical completeness*, where the completeness is considered with respect to an equational theory. Here the completeness is considered with respect to the denotational semantics, so the confluence of  $R_{\text{DN}}$  is not a sufficient proof.

Proving semantic completeness typically involves writing down the normal form of terms after the rewritings. But finding the inductive language for the normal form of general Dirac notations can be quite difficult since whether a subterm is normalized depends on the terms around. Therefore, we prove a weaker form of completeness by considering an expansion on the bases. The completeness also relies on some procedures that is hard to express in term-rewriting. We incorporate them as follows.

*Definition D.2.* We define  $R'_{\text{DN}}$  as the term-rewriting system  $R_{\text{DN}}$  extended with the following procedures:

- (1) the syntactical unification on the basis sort,
- (2) the procedure to decide propositions  $\bigwedge_i s_i = t_i \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_i s'_i = t'_i$  over bases, and
- (3) an expansions of variables on the constant bases before the rewritings of  $R_{\text{DN}}$ , using axioms in Definition 6.1.

Notice that  $e \downarrow_{R'_{\text{DN}}}$  is well-defined and unique because  $R_{\text{DN}}$  is confluent and terminating. In the following we will denote  $e \downarrow_{R'_{\text{DN}}}$  by  $nf(e)$ .



LEMMA D.3.  $\llbracket \delta_{s,t} \rrbracket = 1$  and  $\llbracket \delta_{s,t} \rrbracket = 0$  are decidable in DN.

PROOF. By definition,  $\llbracket \delta_{s,t} \rrbracket = 1$  if and only if  $s \equiv t$ . This can be decided by the rule  $\delta_{s,s} \triangleright 1$  in  $R_{DN}$ . If  $\delta_{s,t} = 0$ , we have for all valuation  $v$ ,  $\llbracket s \rrbracket_v \neq \llbracket t \rrbracket_v$ . Because the denotational semantics of the basis sort does not imply extra equational theories, this inequivalence can be decided by a syntactical unification. That is,  $\delta_{s,t} = 0$  if and only if  $s$  and  $t$  are not unifiable with variables from  $s$  and  $t$ .  $\square$

Definition D.4. The normal form  $NF$  is defined by the following language:

$$\begin{aligned}
NF &::= t \mid a \mid K \mid B \mid O, \\
t &::= x \mid b \mid (t_1, t_2), \quad s ::= b \mid (s_1, s_2), \\
a &::= 0 \mid a_1^+ + \dots + a_n^+, \quad a^+ ::= 1 \mid a_1^\times \times \dots \times a_n^\times, \\
a^\times &::= x \mid x^* \mid \delta_{t_1, t_2} \mid x \cdot |s| \mid x^\dagger \cdot |s| \mid \langle s \mid \cdot x \mid \langle s \mid \cdot x^\dagger \mid \langle s_1 \mid \cdot x \cdot |s_2| \mid \langle s_1 \mid \cdot x^\dagger \cdot |s_2| \rangle, \\
K &::= \mathbf{0}_K(\sigma) \mid K_1^+ + \dots + K_n^+, \quad K^+ ::= |s| \mid a^\times \cdot |s|, \\
B &::= \mathbf{0}_B(\sigma) \mid B_1^+ + \dots + B_n^+, \quad B^+ ::= \langle s \mid \mid a^\times \cdot \langle s \mid, \\
O &::= \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) \mid O_1^+ + \dots + O_n^+, \quad O^+ ::= |s_1| \cdot \langle s_2 \mid \mid a^\times \cdot (|s_1|) \cdot \langle s_2 \mid.
\end{aligned}$$

Here  $b$  represents basis constants, and  $x$  represents variables of the suitable type. There are several extra constraints on the language:

- (1) At least one of  $t_1, t_2$  is atomic in  $\delta_{t_1, t_2}$ .
- (2) The  $\delta_{t_1, t_2}$  terms are not semantically equivalent to 0 or 1. This is well-defined because of Lemma D.3.
- (3) Each term  $K^+, B^+, O^+$  for addition should be unique.

The following lemma proves that  $NF$  is indeed the normal form of  $R_{DN}$ .

LEMMA D.5.  $NF$  is a normal form for  $R'_{DN}$  defined in Definition D.2. That is,  $\forall e \in DN, nf(e) \in NF$ .

PROOF. By induction on the syntax of DN. The normal form is obviously valid for the terminal symbols 0, 1,  $b$ ,  $x$ ,  $\mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{1}$ . Here variables of ket, bra and operator sorts are decomposed. Assume  $L ::= f(L, L)$  is a generation rule of DN, then the induction step becomes

$$\forall e_1, e_2 \in L, (nf(e_1) \in NF) \rightarrow (nf(e_2) \in NF) \rightarrow (nf(f(e_1, e_2)) \in NF).$$

The remaining proof checks such induction steps for all symbols (generation rules) of DN. Here are the examples for the scalar sort:

- $a ::= a_1 + a_2$ . If one of their normal forms is zero, e.g.  $nf(a_1) = 0$ , we have  $nf(a_1 + a_2) = nf(0 + a_2) = nf(a_2) \in NF$ . This is by the rule  $a + 0 \triangleright a$  in  $R_{DN}$ . If  $nf(a_1)$  and  $nf(a_2)$  are summations,  $nf(a_1 + a_2)$  will still be a summation.
- $a ::= a_1 \times a_2$ . If one of their normal forms is zero,  $nf(a_1 \times a_2) = 0 \in NF$  because of the rule  $a \times 0 \triangleright 0$  in  $R_{DN}$ . If both of them are summations,  $nf(a_1 \times a_2)$  will also be a summation. This is because we can rewrite the  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  subterms to their normal forms, and apply the distribution rule  $a \times (b + c) \triangleright (a \times b) + (a \times c)$  in  $R_{DN}$ .
- $a ::= a_1^*$ . If  $nf(a_1) = 0$ , we have the  $0^* \triangleright 0$  rule. Otherwise  $nf(a_1)$  is a summation, and we apply the propagation rules of conjugate on  $a + b$  and  $a \times b$ , so that we only need to consider whether  $\forall a \in a^\times, nf(a^*) \in a^\times$ . This is true by the following rules:  $(a^*)^* \triangleright a$ ,  $\delta_{s_1}^* \triangleright \delta_{s,t}$ ,  $(B \cdot K)^* \triangleright K^\dagger \cdot B^\dagger$  and propagation rules in the ket and bra sort.
- $a ::= \delta_{s,t}$  is directly in  $NF$ .

- $a ::= B \cdot K$ . If one of  $nf(B)$  or  $nf(K)$  is the zero symbol, we have  $nf(B \cdot K) = 0$ . Otherwise,  $nf(B)$  and  $nf(K)$  are summations, and we apply the distribution rule and rewrite the term into  $\sum_{i,j} B_i \cdot K_j$ . Because  $B_i$  and  $K_j$  are either bases, or bases with scalar coefficients, they will be rewritten into 0 or an  $a^+$  term. For example, let  $B_i \equiv a_1 \cdot \langle s_1 |$  and  $K_j \equiv a_2 \cdot |s_2\rangle$ , and we have  $B_i \cdot K_j = (a_1 \cdot \langle s_1 |) \cdot (a_2 \cdot |s_2\rangle) = a_1 \times (\langle s_1 | \cdot (a_2 \cdot |s_2\rangle)) = a_1 \times a_2 \times \langle s_1 | \cdot |s_2\rangle = a_1 \times a_2 \times \delta_{s_1, s_2}$ . Here  $\delta_{s_1, s_2}$  will be reduced to 0 or 1 because  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are constant bases.

The other cases for ket, bra and operator sorts can be analysed in the same approach.  $\square$

LEMMA D.6 (COMPLETENESS FOR  $a^\times$ ). *For all terms  $a_1, a_2$  of  $a^\times$  in NF, if  $\llbracket a_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket a_2 \rrbracket$ , then  $a_1 \equiv a_2$ .*

PROOF. By contraposition, consider all cases where  $a_1, a_2$  are different. It is easy to find the valuation that distinguish the semantics of  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ . For example, if  $a_1 \equiv x$  and  $a_2 \equiv x^*$ , we choose  $v(x) = i$ , so that  $\llbracket a_1 \rrbracket_v = i$  and  $\llbracket a_2 \rrbracket_v = -i$  are different. Therefore,  $\llbracket a_1 \rrbracket \neq \llbracket a_2 \rrbracket$  in this case.  $\square$

LEMMA D.7 (COMPLETENESS FOR  $a^+$ ). *Let  $E$  be the equational theory*

$$\frac{\bigwedge_i s_i = t_i \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_i s'_i = t'_i}{\prod_i \delta_{s_i, t_i} = \prod_i \delta_{s'_i, t'_i}}.$$

*For all terms  $a_1, a_2$  of  $a^+$  in NF, if  $\llbracket a_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket a_2 \rrbracket$ , then  $a_1 \equiv_E a_2$ .*

PROOF. By contraposition. Constant cases are trivial.

If the sequence of product for  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are of the same length, further proof by induction on the length of the product. The induction basis is proved by Lemma D.6. For the induction step, consider the product of all combination of two different  $a^\times$  terms. It turns out that no two different pairs  $a_1 \times a_2$  and  $a'_1 \times a'_2$  will have the same semantics. The only exception is product of Delta operators. For example, we have  $\llbracket \delta_{i,j} \times \delta_{j,k} \rrbracket = \llbracket \delta_{i,k} \times \delta_{j,k} \rrbracket$ . The equational theory  $E$  will discard such exceptions.

If the product sequences have different lengths, the analysis is similar.  $\square$

LEMMA D.8. *Let  $E$  be the equational theory defined in Lemma D.7 For all normal forms  $e_1, e_2$  in NF, if  $\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket$ , then  $e_1 \equiv_E e_2$ .*

PROOF. We prove the contraposition  $\forall e_1, e_2 \in NF, e_1 \not\equiv_E e_2 \rightarrow \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket \neq \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket$ . By induction on  $e_1$ , we need to prove:

- (1) for all terminal symbols  $T$  in NF,  $\forall e_2 \in NF, T \not\equiv_E e_2 \rightarrow \llbracket T \rrbracket \neq \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket$ , and
- (2) for all generation rules of NF, the induction step holds. For example, for  $L ::= f(L, L)$ , the induction step is

$$\begin{aligned} \forall h_1, h_2 \in NF, (\forall e \in NF, h_1 \not\equiv_E e \rightarrow \llbracket h_1 \rrbracket \neq \llbracket e \rrbracket) &\rightarrow \\ (\forall e \in NF, h_2 \not\equiv_E e \rightarrow \llbracket h_2 \rrbracket \neq \llbracket e \rrbracket) &\rightarrow \\ (\forall e \in NF, f(h_1, h_2) \not\equiv_E e \rightarrow \llbracket f(h_1, h_2) \rrbracket \neq \llbracket e \rrbracket). & \end{aligned}$$

The cases of terminal symbols hold trivially. For induction steps, we demonstrate on the scalar sort as an example.

Let  $a ::= a_1 + \dots + a_n$ . Consider different cases of  $e \in NF$ . Because of typing constraints, we only need to consider  $e$  to be a scalar. If  $e \equiv 0$ , we have  $\llbracket a_1 + a_2 \rrbracket > 0 = \llbracket e \rrbracket$ . If  $e \equiv k_1 + \dots + k_m$ , there are two cases:

(a)  $m = n$ , proved by induction on the number of summation terms  $n$ . The induction basis is proved by Lemma D.7, and the induction step is proved through the same idea, by considering all different pairs of summation:

- $1 + 1$  and  $1 + a_1^+$ . They are semantically different because  $a_1^+ = 1$  will never be valid.

- $1 + a_1^+$  and  $1 + a_2^+$ . Reduced to the Lemma D.7 case.
- $1 + a_1^+$  and  $a_1^+ + a_2^+$ . Also because  $a_2^+ = 1$  will never be valid.
- $1 + a_1^+$  and  $a_2^+ + a_3^+$ . By further case analysis on  $a_1, a_2$  and  $a_3$ .
- Other cases are similar.

(b)  $m \neq n$ , the analysis is similar.  $\square$

Concluding the results above, we have the weak completeness theorem.

**THEOREM D.9.** *The extended term-rewriting system  $R_{DN}$  is semantically complete.*

**PROOF.** Combining Lemma D.5 and Lemma D.8. Especially, the procedure to decide propositions  $\bigwedge_i s_i = t_i \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_i s'_i = t'_i$  is used to decide the equational theory defined in Lemma D.6.  $\square$

## E Modular Extension

In the core language DN, we use a primitive language for complex numbers and don't give constructions for the basis. This section discusses how to extend the two parts, and when will the confluence and termination of  $R_{DN}$  preserve.

We first define the module for the systems of atomic basis and complex numbers.

*Definition E.1 (atomic basis signature).* The **atomic basis signature**  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a typed finite language.

Because we consider the tensor product data structure, larger Hilbert spaces can be decomposed into atomic ones, such as the qubit Hilbert space. The atomic basis here characterizes the basis of the atomic Hilbert spaces. We limit the basis signature to finite languages to avoid problems of infinite dimensions.

*Definition E.2 (complex number signature).* The **complex number signature**  $\Sigma_C$  contains at least constant symbols 0, 1, a unary symbol  $*$  and binary symbols  $+$ ,  $\times$ .

The two signatures  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\Sigma_C$  characterize the language for atomic basis and complex numbers. The symbols for complex numbers are zero, one, conjugate, addition and multiplication respectively. These symbols are only the least requirements, and the real language to instantiate can contain more details. For example, the basis can contain symbols 0 and 1 for qubit spaces, and the complex numbers can still have exponential functions  $e^x$  or square roots  $\sqrt{x}$ .

For the extended language, we assume to have the rewriting systems  $R_{\Sigma_C}$  and  $R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}}$ .

*Definition E.3 (TRS  $R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}}$ ).* For the atomic basis language  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}}$  is a terminating and confluent TRS.

*Definition E.4 (TRS  $R_{\Sigma_C}$ ).* For the complex number language  $\Sigma_C$ , the TRS  $R_{\Sigma_C}$  is a TRS such that:

- $R_{\Sigma_C}$  is terminating and confluent,
- for all closed terms  $\alpha, \beta$  and  $\gamma$ , these pairs of terms have the same normal form:  $0 + \alpha$  and  $\alpha$ ,  $0 \times \alpha$  and  $0$ ,  $1 \times \alpha$  and  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \times (\beta + \gamma)$  and  $(\alpha \times \beta) + (\alpha \times \gamma)$ ,  $(\alpha + \beta) + \gamma$  and  $\alpha + (\beta + \gamma)$ ,  $\alpha + \beta$  and  $\beta + \alpha$ ,  $(\alpha \times \beta) \times \gamma$  and  $\alpha \times (\beta \times \gamma)$ ,  $\alpha \times \beta$  and  $\beta \times \alpha$ ,  $(\alpha + \beta)^*$  and  $\alpha^* + \beta^*$ ,  $(\alpha \times \beta)^*$  and  $\alpha^* \times \beta^*$ ,  $(\alpha^*)^*$  and  $\alpha$ .
- 0 and 1 are normal terms.

This definition follows the “scalar rewrite system” in Linear [5].

### E.1 Modularity of Termination

**PROPOSITION E.5.** *The combination of  $R_{DN} \cup R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}} \cup R_{\Sigma_C}$  satisfies the following propositions.*

- $R_{DN}$  and  $R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}}$  are disjoint.

- $R_{DN}$  and  $R_{\Sigma_C}$  form a hierarchical combination.

LEMMA E.6. *CE-termination of  $R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}}$  implies the CE-termination of  $R_{DN} \cup R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}}$ .*

PROOF. It is easy to prove that  $R_{DN}$  is CE-terminating. Then, because  $R_{DN}$  and  $R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}}$  are disjoint, the modularity of CE-termination finishes the proof.  $\square$

Modularity of termination is very weak and does not hold for hierarchical combinations in general. Therefore it is hard to deduce the termination of the whole system  $R_{DN} \cup R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}} \cup R_{\Sigma_C}$  from the termination of  $R_{\Sigma_C}$ .

## E.2 Modularity of Confluence

LEMMA E.7.  *$R_{DN} \cup R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}}$  is confluent.*

PROOF. By modularity of confluence on disjoint TRSs.  $\square$

We can further prove that the system extended with  $R_{\Sigma_C}$  is locally confluent by the avatar lemma [4, 5] introduced below.

*Definition E.8 (Subsumption).* A terminating and confluent relation  $S$  subsumes a relation  $S_0$  if whenever  $t \rightarrow_{S_0} u$ ,  $t$  and  $u$  have the same  $S$ -normal form.

*Definition E.9 (Commuting relations).* Two relations  $X$  and  $Y$  are said to be commuting if whenever  $t \rightarrow_X u$  and  $t \rightarrow_Y v$ , there exists a term  $w$  such that  $u \rightarrow_Y w$  and  $v \rightarrow_X w$ .

LEMMA E.10 (THE AVATAR LEMMA). [4] *Let  $X$ ,  $S$  and  $S_0$  be three relations defined on a set such that:*

- $S$  is terminating and confluent;
- $S$  subsumes  $S_0$ ;
- $S_0 \cup X$  is locally confluent;
- $X$  commutes with  $S^*$ .

*Then, the relation  $S \cup X$  is locally confluent.*

The smaller relation  $S_0$  here is called the avatar since it captures the critical part of the larger relation  $S$  that will appear in the rest part  $X$ . The avatar lemma formalizes our intuition about the modularity of confluence: if we start with the locally confluent system  $S_0 \cup X$  and extend the system from  $S_0$  to  $S$ , which will not interfere with the other part  $X$  and is still confluent, then the whole system  $S \cup X$  will remain locally confluent. In our development of Dirac notations, we will use such avatars to represent the weakest requirement on complex numbers and bases.

We can compare the avatar  $R_{C_0}$  above with the general complex number rewrite system  $R_{\Sigma_C}$  and prove the subsumption relation.

LEMMA E.11.  *$R_{\Sigma_C}$  subsumes  $R_{C_0}$ .*

PROOF. Obvious.  $\square$

With the avatar lemma and the local confluence of  $R_{DN}$ , we can prove the local confluence of the integrated TRS.

THEOREM E.12 (LOCAL CONFLUENCE OF  $R_{DN} \cup R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}} \cup R_{\Sigma_C}$ ). *For any  $R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}}$  and  $R_{\Sigma_C}$ , the system  $R_{DN} \cup R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}} \cup R_{\Sigma_C}$  is locally confluent.*

PROOF. Both  $R_{\Sigma_C}$  is terminating and confluent by definition. The system  $R_{\Sigma_C}$  subsumes  $R_{C_0}$ . By Lemma E.7, the system  $R_{DN} \cup R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}} \cup R_{C_0} = R_{DN} \cup R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}}$  is locally confluent. The system  $R_{\Sigma_C}$  commutes with  $(R_{DN} \cup R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}})^*$ , because the terms in  $\Sigma_C$  appears in the left hand sides of rules in  $R_{DN} \cup R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}}$  only as variables and constants 0, 1, therefore all the rules in  $R_{\Sigma_C}$  commutes with  $(R_{DN} \cup R_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}})^*$ . Then the avatar lemma finishes the proof.  $\square$

## F Dirac Notation Extended Language Rewriting Rules (Full Details)

*Definition F.1 (TRS  $R_{DNE}$ ).* The TRS  $R_{DNE}$  consists of all rewriting rules in this section.

(TYPE-EXT)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi_S(\text{Set}(\sigma)) &\triangleright \sigma & \text{type}(\mathbf{U}(\sigma)) &\triangleright \text{Set}(\sigma) \\
 \text{type}(M_1 \times M_2) &\triangleright \text{Set}(\pi_S(\text{type}(M_1)) \times \pi_S(\text{type}(M_2))) \\
 \text{type}(\sum_{i \in M} a) &\triangleright \mathcal{S} \\
 \text{type}(\Gamma, \sum_{i \in M} K) &\triangleright \text{type}(\Gamma :: (i : \pi_S(\text{type}(M))), K) \\
 \text{type}(\Gamma, \sum_{i \in M} B) &\triangleright \text{type}(\Gamma :: (i : \pi_S(\text{type}(M))), B) \\
 \text{type}(\Gamma, \sum_{i \in M} O) &\triangleright \text{type}(\Gamma :: (i : \pi_S(\text{type}(M))), O)
 \end{aligned}$$

(R-SET-SIMP)

$$\mathbf{U}(\sigma) \times \mathbf{U}(\tau) \triangleright \mathbf{U}(\sigma \times \tau)$$

(R-SUM-CONST)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i \in M} 0 &\triangleright 0 & \sum_{i \in M} \mathbf{0}_K(\sigma) &\triangleright \mathbf{0}_K(\sigma) & \sum_{i \in M} \mathbf{0}_B(\sigma) &\triangleright \mathbf{0}_B(\sigma) & \sum_{i \in M} \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) &\triangleright \mathbf{0}_O(\sigma, \tau) \\
 \mathbf{1}_O(\sigma) &\triangleright \sum_{i \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma)} |i\rangle \cdot \langle i|
 \end{aligned}$$

(R-SUM-ELIM)

One common condition is attached to the following four rules: variable  $i$  does not have a free appearance in term  $s$ . Here,  $S.A$  is interpreted as three cases:  $S.K$ ,  $S.B$ , and  $S.O$ . Here,  $A[i := s]$  denotes the term  $A$  with variable  $i$  substituted by the term  $s$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma)} \delta_{i,s} &\triangleright 1 & \sum_{i \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma)} (\delta_{i,s} \times a) &\triangleright a[i := s] \\
 \sum_{i \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma)} (\delta_{i,s}.A) &\triangleright A[i := s] & \sum_{i \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma)} ((\delta_{i,s} \times a).A) &\triangleright a[i := s].A[i := s] \\
 \sum_{i \in M} \sum_{j \in M} \delta_{i,j} &\triangleright \sum_{j \in M} 1 & \sum_{i \in M} \sum_{j \in M} (\delta_{i,j} \times a) &\triangleright \sum_{j \in M} a[i := j] \\
 \sum_{i \in M} \sum_{j \in M} (\delta_{i,j}.A) &\triangleright \sum_{j \in M} A[i := j] & \sum_{i \in M} \sum_{j \in M} ((\delta_{i,j} \times a).A) &\triangleright \sum_{j \in M} a[i := j].A[i := j]
 \end{aligned}$$

(R-SUM-PUSH)

Here,  $A$  is interpreted in three sorts: ket, bra, and operator. The bind variable  $i$  does not have free appearances in  $X$ . Here  $A \cdot B$  is interpreted as four cases:  $B \cdot K$ ,  $O \cdot K$ ,  $B \cdot O$  and  $O_1 \cdot O_2$ .  $A \otimes B$  is interpreted as four cases:  $K_1 \otimes K_2$ ,  $B_1 \otimes B_2$ ,  $K \cdot B$  and  $O_1 \otimes O_2$ .

$$\begin{array}{l}
\left(\sum_{i \in M} a\right) \times X \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} (a \times X) \quad \left(\sum_{i \in M} a\right)^* \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} a^* \\
\left(\sum_{i \in M} A\right)^\dagger \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} A^\dagger \\
X \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in M} A\right) \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} (X \cdot A) \quad \left(\sum_{i \in M} a\right) \cdot X \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} (a \cdot X) \\
\left(\sum_{i \in M} A\right) \cdot X \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} (A \cdot X) \quad X \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in M} B\right) \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} (X \cdot B) \\
\left(\sum_{i \in M} A\right) \otimes X \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} (A \otimes X) \quad X \otimes \left(\sum_{i \in M} B\right) \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} (X \otimes B)
\end{array}$$

(R-SUM-ADD) Here, the addition  $X + Y$  is interpreted in four sorts: scalar, ket, bra, and operator.

$$\sum_{i \in M} (X + Y) \triangleright \left(\sum_{i \in M} X\right) + \left(\sum_{i \in M} Y\right)$$

$$\sum_{i \in M} (a \cdot X) + \sum_{i \in M} X \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} (a + 1) \cdot X \quad \sum_{i \in M} (a \cdot X) + \sum_{i \in M} (b \cdot X) \triangleright \sum_{i \in M} (a + b) \cdot X$$

(R-SUM-INDEX) The following two rules hold for all sorts.

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma \times \tau)} A \triangleright \sum_{j \in \mathbf{U}(\sigma)} \sum_{k \in \mathbf{U}(\tau)} A[i := (j, k)] \quad \sum_{i \in M_1 \times M_2} A \triangleright \sum_{j \in M_1} \sum_{k \in M_2} A[i := (j, k)]$$

## G Introducing fst and snd

This section introduces the extension with projectors `fst` and `snd`, including the syntax, typing rules, semantics, and rewriting rules.

*Definition G.1 (syntax).*

$$\text{(Basis)} \quad s ::= \text{fst } s \mid \text{snd } s$$

*Definition G.2 (typing).*

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \sigma : P_1 * P_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash s : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fst } s : \pi_1(\sigma)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \sigma : P_1 * P_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash s : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \text{snd } s : \pi_2(\sigma)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash s : \sigma \times \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fst } s : \sigma} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : \sigma \times \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \text{snd } s : \tau}$$

*Definition G.3 (denotational semantics).*

$$\text{(Basis)} \quad \begin{array}{ll} \llbracket \text{fst } t \rrbracket \equiv x_1 & \text{(where } \llbracket t \rrbracket = (x_1, x_2)\text{)}, \\ \llbracket \text{snd } t \rrbracket \equiv x_2 & \text{(where } \llbracket t \rrbracket = (x_1, x_2)\text{)} \end{array}$$

*Definition G.4 (axiomatic semantics).*

$$\text{fst } (s, t) = s \quad \text{snd } (s, t) = t$$

(PROJ-CORE)

$$\text{type}(\text{fst } s) \triangleright \pi_1(\text{type}(s)) \quad \text{type}(\text{snd } s) \triangleright \pi_2(\text{type}(s))$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{fst } (s, t) \triangleright s \quad \text{snd } (s, t) \triangleright t \quad (\text{fst } s, \text{snd } s) \triangleright s \\ \delta_{s, (u, v)} \triangleright \delta_{\text{fst } s, u} \times \delta_{\text{snd } s, v} \quad \delta_{\text{fst } s, \text{fst } t} \times \delta_{\text{snd } s, \text{snd } t} \triangleright \delta_{s, t} \\ (B_1 \otimes B_2) \cdot |t\rangle \triangleright (B_1 \cdot |\text{fst } t\rangle) \times (B_2 \cdot |\text{snd } t\rangle) \\ \langle t| \cdot (K_1 \otimes K_2) \triangleright (\langle \text{fst } t| \cdot K_1) \times (\langle \text{snd } t| \cdot K_2) \\ \langle s| \cdot ((O_1 \otimes O_2) \cdot K) \triangleright ((\langle \text{fst } s| \cdot O_1) \otimes (\langle \text{snd } s| \cdot O_2)) \cdot K \\ (O_1 \otimes O_2) \cdot |t\rangle \triangleright (O_1 \cdot |\text{fst } t\rangle) \otimes (O_2 \cdot |\text{snd } t\rangle) \\ \langle t| \cdot (O_1 \otimes O_2) \triangleright (\langle \text{fst } t| \cdot O_1) \otimes (\langle \text{snd } t| \cdot O_2) \end{aligned}$$

(PROJ-SUM-INDEX)

Replace the original (SUM-INDEX) with (PROJ-SUM-INDEX) rules.

$$\frac{\text{fst } i \text{ not free in } A \vee \text{snd } i \text{ not free in } A}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}(\sigma \times \tau)} A \triangleright \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}(\sigma)} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}(\tau)} A[\text{fst } i := j, \text{snd } i := k, i := (j, k)]}$$

$$\frac{\text{fst } i \text{ not free in } A \vee \text{snd } i \text{ not free in } A}{\sum_{i \in M_1 \times M_2} A \triangleright \sum_{j \in M_1} \sum_{k \in M_2} A[\text{fst } i := j, \text{snd } i := k, i := (j, k)]}$$

$$\frac{j \text{ and } k \text{ appear in } A \text{ only as } (j, k)}{\sum_{j \in M_1} \sum_{k \in M_2} A \triangleright \sum_{i \in M_1 \times M_2} A[(j, k) := i]}$$

## H CoqQ Example List

This section presents the example list. All the examples are encoded in DiracDec and checked within reasonable time. Notice that more examples are included in the artifact.

### H.1 Examples from *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* [54]

*Example H.1 (QCQI (2.10)).*

$$A\left(\sum_i a_i |v_i\rangle\right) = \sum_i a_i A(|v_i\rangle).$$

*Example H.2 (QCQI (2.13)).*

$$\begin{aligned} \left(|v\rangle, \sum_i \lambda_i |w_i\rangle\right) &= \sum_i \lambda_i (|v\rangle, |w_i\rangle). \\ (|v\rangle, |w\rangle) &= (|w\rangle, |v\rangle)^*. \end{aligned}$$

*Example H.3 (QCQI Exercise 2.6).*

$$\left(\sum_i \lambda_i |w_i\rangle, |v\rangle\right) = \sum_i \lambda_i^* (|w_i\rangle, |v\rangle).$$



*Example H.4 (QCQI (2.18)).* For orthonormal basis  $|i\rangle$ ,

$$\left( \sum_i v_i |i\rangle, \sum_j w_j |j\rangle \right) = \sum_{ij} v_i^* w_j \delta_{ij} = \sum_i v_i^* w_i.$$

*Example H.5 (QCQI (2.21)).*

$$\left( \sum_i |i\rangle \langle i| \right) |v\rangle = \sum_i |i\rangle \langle i|v\rangle.$$

Notice the slippery informal expression here.  $|v\rangle$  should actually be  $v$ .

*Example H.6 (QCQI (2.22)).*

$$\sum_i |i\rangle \langle i| = I.$$

(In our language, identity operator  $I$  will be a symbol.a)

*Example H.7 (QCQI (2.24-2.25)).*

$$\sum_{ij} |w_j\rangle \langle w_j| A |v_i\rangle \langle v_i| = \sum_{ij} \langle w_j| A |v_i\rangle |w_j\rangle \langle v_i|.$$

*Example H.8 (QCQI (2.26)).*

$$\langle v|v\rangle \langle w|w\rangle = \sum_i \langle v|i\rangle \langle i|v\rangle \langle w|w\rangle.$$

*Example H.9 (QCQI Exercise 2.14).*

$$\left( \sum_i a_i A_i \right)^\dagger = \sum_i a_i^* A_i^\dagger.$$

*Example H.10 (QCQI Exercise 2.16).* Show that any projector  $P \equiv \sum_{i=1}^k |i\rangle \langle i|$  satisfies the equation  $P^2 = P$ .

*Example H.11 (QCQI (2.46)).*

$$(A \otimes B) \left( \sum_i a_i |v_i\rangle \otimes |w_i\rangle \right) \equiv \sum_i a_i A |v_i\rangle \otimes B |w_i\rangle.$$

*Example H.12 (QCQI (2.49)).*

$$\left( \sum_i a_i |v_i\rangle \otimes |w_i\rangle, \sum_j b_j |v'_j\rangle \otimes |w'_j\rangle \right) \equiv \sum_{ij} a_i^* b_j \langle v_i|v'_j\rangle \langle w_i|w'_j\rangle.$$

*Example H.13 (QCQI (2.61)).*

$$\sum_i \langle i| A |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|i\rangle = \langle \psi| A |\psi\rangle.$$

*Example H.14 (QCQI (2.128)).*

$$\sum_{m', m''} \langle \psi| M_m^\dagger \langle m'| (I \otimes |m\rangle \langle m|) M_{m''} |\psi\rangle |m''\rangle = \langle \psi| M_m^\dagger M_m |\psi\rangle.$$

*Example H.15 (QCQI Theorem 4.1).* Suppose  $U$  is a unitary operation on a single qubit. Then there exist real numbers  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  and  $\delta$  such that

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} e^{i(\alpha-\beta/2-\delta/2)} \cos \frac{\gamma}{2} & -e^{i(\alpha-\beta/2+\delta/2)} \sin \frac{\gamma}{2} \\ e^{i(\alpha+\beta/2-\delta/2)} \sin \frac{\gamma}{2} & e^{i(\alpha+\beta/2+\delta/2)} \cos \frac{\gamma}{2} \end{bmatrix} = e^{i\alpha} R_z(\beta) R_y(\gamma) R_z(\delta),$$

where

$$R_x(\theta) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} & -i \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \\ -i \sin \frac{\theta}{2} & \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \end{bmatrix} \quad R_y(\theta) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} & -\sin \frac{\theta}{2} \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} & \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \end{bmatrix} \quad R_z(\theta) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} e^{-i\theta/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta/2} \end{bmatrix}$$

are the rotation gates.

## H.2 Operation on Maximally Entangled State

*Example H.16.* Assume  $S$  and  $T$  are subsystems on Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_T$  and  $|\Phi\rangle_{S,T} = \sum_i |i\rangle |i\rangle$  is a maximally entangled state. Then for all operators  $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{H}_T)$ , we have

$$A_S |\Phi\rangle_{S,T} = A_T^T |\Phi\rangle_{S,T}.$$

These examples come from the CoqQ project. The examples are listed in the order of their appearance in CoqQ.

*Definition H.17.* Some high-level operators are encoded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} B^T &\equiv \sum_{i \in U} (B \cdot |i\rangle) |i\rangle \\ K^T &\equiv \sum_{i \in U} (\langle i| \cdot K) \langle i| \\ O^T &\equiv \sum_{i,j \in U} (\langle i| O |j\rangle) |j\rangle \langle i| \\ O^* &\equiv (O^\dagger)^T \\ \text{tr}(A) &\equiv \sum_{i \in U} \langle i| A |i\rangle \\ \text{SWAP}(A) &\equiv \sum_{i \in U} \sum_{j \in U} \sum_{k \in U} \sum_{l \in U} \langle i, j| A |k, l\rangle |j, i\rangle \langle l, k| \\ \text{tr}_1(A) &\equiv \sum_{i \in U} \sum_{j \in U} \left( \sum_{k \in U} \langle k, i| A |k, j\rangle \right) |i\rangle \langle j| \\ \text{tr}_2(A) &\equiv \sum_{i \in U} \sum_{j \in U} \left( \sum_{k \in U} \langle i, k| A |j, k\rangle \right) |i\rangle \langle j| \\ \text{diagmx}(K) &\equiv \sum_{i \in U} (\langle i| K |i\rangle) \langle i| \\ \text{cplmt}(A) &\equiv I - A \\ \text{formlf}(A, X) &\equiv A \cdot X \cdot A^\dagger \\ A \text{ is Hermitian} &\equiv A^\dagger = A \\ A \text{ is normal} &\equiv A \cdot A^\dagger = A^\dagger \cdot A \\ A \text{ is projection} &\equiv A^\dagger = A \wedge A \cdot A = A \\ A \text{ is isometry} &\equiv A^\dagger \cdot A = I \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
A \text{ is bi-isometry} &\equiv A^\dagger \cdot A = I \wedge A \cdot A^\dagger = I \\
A \text{ is unitary} &\equiv A^\dagger \cdot A = I \wedge A \cdot A^\dagger = I \\
F \text{ is quantum measurement} &\equiv \sum_{i \in M} F_i^\dagger \cdot F_i = I \quad F : M \rightarrow \mathcal{O}
\end{aligned}$$

*Definition H.18.* Dealing with super-operator (quantum operation, and etc). Super-operators are linear mapping from operator to operator, and have general Kraus representation:  $\mathcal{E}(X) = \sum_{i \in M} E_i \cdot X \cdot F_i^\dagger$ , for some finite index set  $M$  and function  $E, F : M \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ . As such, we can quantify over  $M, E$ , and  $F$  to examine if the property holds for all super-operators.

Furthermore, two super-operators  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  are equal if and only if  $\forall X, \mathcal{E}(X) = \mathcal{F}(X)$ , this allows us to use the Dirac equation (with the free occurrence of  $X$ ) to reasoning about the equation of super-operators. Formally, we define following high-level operators to examine examples in CoqQ/quantum.v:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{superop}(M, E, F)(X) &\equiv \sum_{i \in M} E_i \cdot X \cdot F_i^\dagger \quad E, F : M \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \\
\text{so2choi}(\mathcal{E}) &\equiv \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} |i\rangle \langle j| \otimes (\mathcal{E}(|i\rangle \langle j|)) \\
\text{choi2so}(A)(X) &\equiv \text{tr}_1(A \cdot (X^T \otimes I)) \\
\text{krausso}(M, E)(X) &\equiv \text{superop}(M, E, E)(X) \quad E : M \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \\
\text{dualso}(\mathcal{E})(X) &\equiv \text{choi2so}(\text{SWAP}(\text{so2choi}(\mathcal{E}))^T) \\
\text{elemso}(E, k)(X) &\equiv E_k \cdot X \cdot E_k^\dagger \quad E : M \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \\
\text{dualqm}(M, E, O) &\equiv \sum_{i \in M} E_i^\dagger \cdot O_i \cdot E_i \quad E, O : M \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \\
\text{idso}(X) &\equiv X \\
\text{abortso}(X) &\equiv 0 \\
\text{formso}(A)(X) &\equiv A \cdot X \cdot A^\dagger \\
\text{unitaryso}(A)(X) &\equiv \text{formso}(A)(X) \\
\text{addso}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})(X) &\equiv \mathcal{E}(X) + \mathcal{F}(X) \\
\text{oppso}(\mathcal{E})(X) &\equiv -\mathcal{E}(X) \\
\text{sumso}(M, \mathcal{F})(X) &\equiv \sum_{i \in M} \mathcal{F}_i(X) \\
\text{scaleso}(c, \mathcal{E})(X) &\equiv c\mathcal{E}(X) \\
\text{compso}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})(X) &\equiv \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}(X)) \\
\text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})(X) &\equiv \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E}(X)) \\
\text{initialso}(|v\rangle)(X) &\equiv \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}} |v\rangle \langle i| X |i\rangle \langle v| \\
\text{ifso}(M, E, \mathcal{F})(X) &\equiv \sum_{i \in M} \mathcal{F}_i(E_i \cdot X \cdot E_i^\dagger) \quad E : M \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, \quad \mathcal{F} : M \rightarrow \mathcal{SO}
\end{aligned}$$

Here is the list of examples examined in CoqQ/quantum.v and CoqQ/mxpred.v. To clarify bias, we have annotated the lemma's name of each equation from in CoqQ/quantum.v (the v1.0 version of its recent release).

----- Examples in the main body -----

- $\langle k, p | ((|i\rangle \langle j| \otimes I) \cdot A) |q\rangle = \delta_{i,k} \langle j, p | A |q\rangle$ ,
- $c > 0 \rightarrow c \sum_{i \in T} (f_i \cdot X \cdot f_i^\dagger) = \sum_{i \in T} ((\sqrt{c} f_i \cdot X) \cdot (\sqrt{c} f_i^\dagger))$ ,
- $\sum_{i \in T} f_i \cdot (\sum_{j \in R} g_j \cdot X \cdot g_j^\dagger) \cdot f_i^\dagger = \sum_{i \in T \times R} f_{fst\ k} \cdot g_{snd\ k} \cdot X \cdot f_{fst\ k}^\dagger \cdot g_{snd\ k}^\dagger$ ,
- $\sum_{i \in U} \langle i | \cdot (M \otimes N) \cdot |i\rangle = (\sum_{i \in U} \langle i | \cdot M \cdot |i\rangle) \times (\sum_{j \in U} \langle j | \cdot N \cdot |j\rangle)$ , and
- $\sum_{i \in U} \langle i | (\sum_{j,k} |j\rangle \langle k| \otimes (\sum_l E_l |j\rangle \langle k| E_l^\dagger)) \cdot (\sum_{r \in U, t \in U} \langle r | X |t\rangle |t\rangle \langle r|) \otimes Y) |i\rangle = \sum_{i \in U} \langle i | ((\sum_{j \in U} E_j \cdot X \cdot E_j^\dagger) \cdot Y) |i\rangle$

----- Example of equations of linear operator (from quantum.v) -----

- (1) (lftrace\_baseE)  $\text{tr}(A) = \sum_{i \in U} \langle i | A |i\rangle$
- (2) (lftraceC)  $\text{tr}(AB) = \text{tr}(BA)$
- (3) (lftrace\_is\_linear)  $\text{tr}(cA + B) = c \text{tr}(A) + \text{tr}(B)$
- (4) (lftrace\_adj)  $\text{tr}(A^\dagger) = \text{tr}(A)^*$
- (5) (lftrace\_tr)  $\text{tr}(A^T) = \text{tr}(A)$
- (6) (lftrace\_conj)  $\text{tr}(A^*) = \text{tr}(A)^*$
- (7) (outp\_trlf)  $\text{tr}(|u\rangle \langle v|) = \langle v | u \rangle$  ( $u, v$  are arbitrary vectors)
- (8) (sumeb\_out)  $\sum_{i \in U} |i\rangle \langle i| = I$
- (9) (delta\_lf\_eb)  $|i\rangle \langle j| \cdot |k\rangle = \delta_{k,j} |i\rangle$
- (10) (comp\_delta\_lf\_cond)  $|i\rangle \langle j| \cdot |k\rangle \langle l| = \delta_{j,k} |i\rangle \langle l|$
- (11) (comp\_delta\_lf)  $|i\rangle \langle j| \cdot |j\rangle \langle k| = |i\rangle \langle k|$
- (12) (trlf\_deltar)  $\text{tr}(A |i\rangle \langle j|) = \langle j | (A |i\rangle)$
- (13) (lfun\_sum\_delta)  $A = \sum_{j \in U} \sum_{i \in U} \langle i | (A |j\rangle) |i\rangle \langle j|$
- (14) (onb\_dot(CB))  $\langle i | j \rangle = \delta_{i,j}$
- (15) (onb\_vec(CB))  $|v\rangle = \sum_{i \in U} (\langle i | v \rangle) |i\rangle$
- (16) (outp\_complV)  $(A |u\rangle) \langle v| = A(|u\rangle \langle v|)$
- (17) (outp\_comprV)  $|u\rangle (A |v\rangle)^\dagger = (|u\rangle \langle v|) A^\dagger$
- (18) (onb\_lfun(CB))  $A = \sum_{i \in U} (A |i\rangle) \langle i|$
- (19) (sumonb\_out\_bool(CB))  $|0\rangle \langle 0| + |1\rangle \langle 1| = I$
- (20) (ponb\_ns(CB))  $\langle i | i \rangle = 1$
- (21) (linear\_tensmx)  $A \otimes (aB + C) = a(A \otimes B) + (A \otimes C)$
- (22) (linear\_tensmxr)  $(aA + B) \otimes C = a(A \otimes C) + (B \otimes C)$
- (23) (adjmx\_tens)  $(M \otimes N)^\dagger = M^\dagger \otimes N^\dagger$
- (24) (mxtrace\_tens)  $\text{tr}(M \otimes N) = \text{tr}(M) \text{tr}(N)$
- (25) (tr\_tens)  $\text{tr} A = \sum_i \sum_j \langle i, j | A |i, j\rangle$
- (26) (mxswapK)  $\text{SWAP}(\text{SWAP}(A)) = A$
- (27) (mxswap\_is\_linear)  $\text{SWAP}(aX + Y) = a\text{SWAP}(X) + \text{SWAP}(Y)$
- (28) (mxswap\_tens)  $\text{SWAP}(A \otimes B) = B \otimes A$
- (29) (mxswap\_trace)  $\text{tr}(\text{SWAP}(A)) = \text{tr}(A)$
- (30) (mxswap\_mul)  $\text{SWAP}(A \cdot B) = \text{SWAP}(A) \cdot \text{SWAP}(B)$
- (31) (mxswap\_trmx)  $\text{SWAP}(A)^T = \text{SWAP}(A^T)$
- (32) (mxswap\_trmxC)  $\text{SWAP}(A)^\dagger = \text{SWAP}(A^\dagger)$
- (33) (ptrace2E1)  $\text{tr}_2(A) = \text{tr}_1(\text{SWAP}(A))$

- (34) (ptrace1E2)  $\text{tr}_1(A) = \text{tr}_2(\text{SWAP}(A))$   
(35) (ptrace2\_is\_linear)  $\text{tr}_2(cA + B) = \text{ctr}_2(A) + \text{tr}_2(B)$   
(36) (ptrace1\_is\_linear)  $\text{tr}_1(cA + B) = \text{ctr}_1A + \text{tr}_1B$   
(37) (tr\_ptrace2)  $\text{tr}(A) = \text{tr}(\text{tr}_2(A))$   
(38) (tr\_ptrace1)  $\text{tr}(A) = \text{tr}(\text{tr}_1(A))$   
(39) (ptrace1\_mul\_tens1mx)  $\text{tr}_1(A \cdot (I \otimes B)) = \text{tr}_1(A) \cdot B$   
(40) (tensmx11)  $I \otimes I = I$   
(41) (tensmxE\_mid)  $\langle i | A \cdot B | j \rangle = \sum_{a \in U} \sum_{b \in U} \langle i | A | a, b \rangle \langle a, b | B | j \rangle$   
(42) (tens\_delta\_mx1\_mulEl)  $\langle k, p | ((|i\rangle \langle j| \otimes I) \cdot A) | q \rangle = \delta_{i,k} \langle j, p | A | q \rangle$   
(43) (tens\_delta\_mx1\_mulEr)  $\langle p | (A \cdot (|i\rangle \langle j| \otimes I)) | k, q \rangle = \delta_{j,k} \langle p | A | i, q \rangle$   
(44) (diag\_mx\_tens)  $\text{diagmx}(K_1 \otimes K_2) = \text{diagmx}(K_1) \otimes \text{diagmx}(K_2)$   
(45) (ptrace2\_mulmxI)  $\text{tr}_2(A \cdot (B \otimes I)) = \text{tr}_2(A) \cdot B$   
(46) (mulmx\_diag\_colrow)  $A \cdot \text{diagmx}(K) \cdot B = \sum_{i \in U} (\langle i | K) ((A | i) \cdot (\langle i | B))$   
(47) (cplmtE)  $1 - A = \text{cplmt}(A)$   
(48) (cplmtK)  $\text{cplmt}(\text{cplmt}(A)) = A$   
(49) (cplmt1) **[FAIL]**  $\text{cplmt}(I) = 0$   
(50) (cplmt0)  $\text{cplmt}(0) = I$   
(51) (formlf\_comp)  $\text{formlf}(A, \text{formlf}(B, X)) = \text{formlf}(A \cdot B, X)$   
(52) (formlf\_adj)  $\text{formlf}(A, X)^\dagger = \text{formlf}(A, X^\dagger)$   
(53) (formlf1E)  $\text{formlf}(A, I) = A \cdot A^\dagger$   
(54) (formlf1EV)  $\text{formlf}(A^\dagger, I) = A^\dagger \cdot A$   
(55) (formlfE)  $\text{formlf}(A, X) = A \cdot X \cdot A^\dagger$   
(56) (formlfEV)  $\text{formlf}(A^\dagger, X) = A^\dagger \cdot X \cdot A$   
(57) (formlf\_linear)  $\text{formlf}(A, cX + Y) = c \cdot \text{formlf}(A, X) + \text{formlf}(A, Y)$

----- Example of equations of super-operator -----

- (58) (superop\_is\_linear)  $\mathcal{E}(aX + Y) = a\mathcal{E}(X) + \mathcal{E}(Y)$   
(59) (addsoA)  $\text{addso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{addso}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3))(X) = \text{addso}(\text{addso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3)(X)$   
(60) (addsoC)  $\text{addso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)(X) = \text{addso}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_1)(X)$   
(61) (add0so)  $\text{addso}(\text{abortso}, \mathcal{E})(X) = \mathcal{E}(X)$   
(62) (addNso)  $\text{addso}(\text{oppso}(\mathcal{E}), \mathcal{E})(X) = \text{abortso}(X)$   
(63) (scale1so)  $\text{scaleso}(1, \mathcal{E})(X) = \mathcal{E}(X)$   
(64) (scalesoDl)  $\text{scaleso}(a + b, \mathcal{E})(X) = \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}), \text{scaleso}(b, \mathcal{E}))(X)$   
(65) (scalesoDr)  $\text{scaleso}(a, \text{addso}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))(X) = \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}), \text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{F}))(X)$   
(66) (scalesoA)  $\text{scaleso}(a, \text{scaleso}(b, \mathcal{E}))(X) = \text{scaleso}(a * b, \mathcal{E})(X)$   
(67) (abort\_soE)  $\text{abortso}(X) = 0$   
(68) (add\_soE)  $\text{addso}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})(X) = \mathcal{E}(X) + \mathcal{F}(X)$   
(69) (opp\_soE)  $\text{oppso}(\mathcal{E})(X) = -\mathcal{E}(X)$   
(70) (sum\_soE)  $\text{sumso}(M, f)(X) = \sum_{i \in M} f_i(X)$   
(71) (scale\_soE)  $\text{scaleso}(c, \mathcal{E})(X) = c\mathcal{E}(X)$   
(72) (comp\_soElr)  $\text{compso}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})(X) = \text{compsor}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E})(X)$   
(73) (comp\_soErl)  $\text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})(X) = \text{compso}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E})(X)$   
(74) (id\_soE)  $\text{idso}(X) = X$   
(75) (comp\_soE)  $\text{compso}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})(X) = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}(X))$   
(76) (comp\_sorE)  $\text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})(X) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E}(X))$   
(77) (comp\_soA)  $\text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3))(X) = \text{compso}(\text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3)(X)$   
(78) (comp\_sorA)  $\text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3))(X) = \text{compsor}(\text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3)(X)$

- (79)  $(\text{linear\_comp\_so}) \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$   
 $= \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)), \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$
- (80)  $(\text{linear\_compr\_so}) \text{compso}(\text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}_1), \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3)(X)$   
 $= \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_3)), \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$
- (81)  $(\text{linear\_comp\_sor}) \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$   
 $= \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)), \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$
- (82)  $(\text{linear\_compr\_sor}) \text{compsor}(\text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}_1), \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3)(X)$   
 $= \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_3)), \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$
- (83)  $(\text{comp\_so1l}) \text{compso}(\text{idso}, \mathcal{E})(X) = \mathcal{E}(X)$
- (84)  $(\text{comp\_so1r}) \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}, \text{idso})(X) = \mathcal{E}(X)$
- (85)  $(\text{comp\_so0l}) \text{compso}(\text{abortso}, \mathcal{E})(X) = \text{abortso}(X)$
- (86)  $(\text{comp\_so0r}) \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}, \text{abortso})(X) = \text{abortso}(X)$
- (87)  $(\text{comp\_soDl}) \text{compso}(\text{addso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3)(X) = \text{addso}(\text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_3), \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$
- (88)  $(\text{comp\_soDr}) \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{addso}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3))(X) = \text{addso}(\text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2), \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$
- (89)  $(\text{comp\_soNl}) \text{compso}(\text{oppso}(\mathcal{E}_1), \mathcal{E}_2)(X) = \text{oppso}(\text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2))(X)$
- (90)  $(\text{comp\_soNr}) \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{oppso}(\mathcal{E}_2))(X) = \text{oppso}(\text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2))(X)$
- (91)  $(\text{comp\_soZl}) \text{compso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}_1), \mathcal{E}_2)(X) = \text{scaleso}(a, \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2))(X)$
- (92)  $(\text{comp\_soZr}) \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}_2))(X) = \text{scaleso}(a, \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2))(X)$
- (93)  $(\text{comp\_soPl}) \text{compso}(\text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}_1), \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3)(X)$   
 $= \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_3)), \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$
- (94)  $(\text{comp\_soPr}) \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$   
 $= \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)), \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$
- (95)  $(\text{comp\_sor1l}) \text{compsor}(\text{idso}, \mathcal{E})(X) = \mathcal{E}(X)$
- (96)  $(\text{comp\_sor1r}) \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}, \text{idso})(X) = \mathcal{E}(X)$
- (97)  $(\text{comp\_sor0l}) \text{compsor}(\text{abortso}, \mathcal{E})(X) = \text{abortso}(X)$
- (98)  $(\text{comp\_sor0r}) \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}, \text{abortso})(X) = \text{abortso}(X)$
- (99)  $(\text{comp\_sorDl}) \text{compsor}(\text{addso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3)(X) = \text{addso}(\text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_3), \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$
- (100)  $(\text{comp\_sorDr}) \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{addso}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3))(X) = \text{addso}(\text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2), \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$
- (101)  $(\text{comp\_sorNl}) \text{compsor}(\text{oppso}(\mathcal{E}_1), \mathcal{E}_2)(X) = \text{oppso}(\text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2))(X)$
- (102)  $(\text{comp\_sorNr}) \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{oppso}(\mathcal{E}_2))(X) = \text{oppso}(\text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2))(X)$
- (103)  $(\text{comp\_sorZl}) \text{compsor}(\text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}_1), \mathcal{E}_2)(X) = \text{scaleso}(a, \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2))(X)$
- (104)  $(\text{comp\_sorZr}) \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}_2))(X) = \text{scaleso}(a, \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2))(X)$
- (105)  $(\text{comp\_sorPl}) \text{compsor}(\text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}_1), \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3)(X)$   
 $= \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_3)), \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$
- (106)  $(\text{comp\_sorPr}) \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$   
 $= \text{addso}(\text{scaleso}(a, \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2)), \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_3))(X)$
- (107)  $(\text{comp\_soACA}) \text{compso}(\text{compso}(\text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3), \mathcal{E}_4)(X)$   
 $= \text{compso}(\text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{compso}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3)), \mathcal{E}_4)(X)$
- (108)  $(\text{comp\_sorACA}) \text{compsor}(\text{compsor}(\text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2), \mathcal{E}_3), \mathcal{E}_4)(X)$   
 $= \text{compsor}(\text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_1, \text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_3)), \mathcal{E}_4)(X)$
- (109)  $(\text{krausso\_fun\_is\_linear}) \text{krausso}(M, E)(aX + Y) = a \cdot \text{krausso}(M, E)(X) + \text{krausso}(M, E)(Y)$
- (110)  $(\text{kraussoE}) \text{krausso}(M, E)(X) = \sum_{i \in M} E_i \cdot X \cdot E_i^\dagger$
- (111)  $(\text{formsoE}) \text{formso}(A)(X) = A \cdot X \cdot A^\dagger$
- (112)  $(\text{formso0}) \text{formso}(0)(X) = \text{abortso}(X)$
- (113)  $(\text{ifso\_fun\_is\_linear}) \text{ifso}(M, E, \mathcal{F})(aX + Y) = \text{aifso}(M, E, \mathcal{F})(X) + \text{ifso}(M, E, \mathcal{F})(Y)$
- (114)  $(\text{ifsoE}) \text{ifso}(M, E, \mathcal{F})(X) = \sum_{i \in M} \mathcal{F}_i(E_i \cdot X \cdot E_i^\dagger)$
- (115)  $(\text{formso1}) \text{formso}(I)(X) = \text{idso}(X)$

- (116) (`comp_krausso`)  $compso(krausso(M_1, E_1), krausso(M_2, E_2))(X) = krausso(M_1 \times M_2, \lambda i. E_1(\text{fst } i) \cdot E_2(\text{snd } i))(X)$
- (117) (`compr_krausso`)  $compsor(krausso(M_1, E_1), krausso(M_2, E_2))(X) = krausso(M_1 \times M_2, \lambda i. E_2(\text{snd } i) \cdot E_1(\text{fst } i))(X)$
- (118) (`ifso_krausso`)  $ifso(M, E, \lambda i. krausso(N, F_i))(X) = krausso(M \times N, \lambda i. F_{\text{fst } i, \text{snd } i} \cdot E_{\text{fst } i})(X)$
- (119) (`scaleso_krausso`)  $0 \leq c \rightarrow scaleso(c, krausso(M, f))(X) = krausso(M, \lambda i. (\sqrt{c}f_i))(X)$
- (120) (`choimxE`)  $\text{tr}_1(\text{so2choi}(E) \cdot (X^T \otimes I)) = \sum_{k \in U} E_k X E_k^\dagger$
- (121) (`choi2so_fun_is_linear`) **[FAIL]**  $\text{choi2so}(cA + B)(X) = \text{addso}(scaleso(c, \text{choi2so}(A)), \text{choi2so}(B))(X)$
- (122) (`choi2so_soE`)  $\text{choi2so}(A)(X) = \text{tr}_1(A \cdot (X^T \otimes I))$
- (123) (`so2choiK`)  $\text{choi2so}(\text{so2choi}(\mathcal{E}))(X) = \mathcal{E}(X)$
- (124) (`choi2soK`)  $\text{so2choi}(\text{choi2so}(A)) = A$
- (125) (`so2choi_is_linear`)  $\text{so2choi}(\text{addso}(scaleso(c, \mathcal{E}), \mathcal{F})) = c \cdot \text{so2choi}(\mathcal{E}) + \text{so2choi}(\mathcal{F})$
- (126) (`choi2so_is_linear`) **[FAIL]**  $\text{choi2so}(cA+B)(X) = \text{addso}(scaleso(c, \text{choi2so}(A)), \text{choi2so}(B))(X)$
- (127) (`tr_choi_sep`)  $\text{tr}(\text{so2choi}(E) \cdot (X^T \otimes Y)) = \text{tr}(E(X) \cdot Y)$
- (128) (`krausso2choiE`)  $\sum_{k \in M} (\sum_{i \in U} |i\rangle \otimes (E_k |i\rangle)) \cdot (\sum_{i \in U} |i\rangle \otimes (E_k |i\rangle))^\dagger = \text{so2choi}(krausso(M, E))$
- (129) (`dualsoK`)  $dualso(dualso(\mathcal{E}))(X) = \mathcal{E}(X)$
- (130) (`dualso_trlfE`)  $\text{tr}(E(X) \cdot A) = \text{tr}(X \cdot E^*(A))$
- (131) (`dualso_trlfEV`)  $\text{tr}(A \cdot E(X)) = \text{tr}(E^*(X) \cdot A)$
- (132) (`dualso_krausE`)  $dualso(krausso(M, E))(X) = \sum_{i \in M} E_i^\dagger \cdot X \cdot E_i$
- (133) (`dualso_formE`)  $dualso(\text{formso}(A))(X) = A^\dagger \cdot X \cdot A$
- (134) (`dualso_krausso`)  $dualso(krausso(M, E))(X) = krausso(M, \lambda i. E_i^\dagger)(X)$
- (135) (`dualso_formso`)  $dualso(\text{formso}(A))(X) = \text{formso}(A^\dagger)(X)$
- (136) (`dualso_is_linear`) **[FAIL]**  $dualso(\text{addso}(scaleso(a, \mathcal{E}), \mathcal{F}))(X) = \text{addso}(scaleso(a, dualso(\mathcal{E})), dualso(\mathcal{F}))(X)$
- (137) (`formso_dual`)  $dualso(\text{formso}(A))(X) = \text{formso}(A^\dagger)(X)$
- (138) (`abortso_formE`)  $\text{abortso}(X) = \text{formso}(0)(X)$
- (139) (`dualso0`) **[FAIL]**  $dualso(\text{abortso})(X) = \text{abortso}(X)$
- (140) (`idso_formE`)  $\text{idso}(X) = \text{formso}(I)(X)$
- (141) (`dualso1`)  $dualso(\text{idso})(X) = \text{idso}(X)$
- (142) (`unitaryso1`)  $\text{unitaryso}(I)(X) = \text{idso}(X)$
- (143) (`dualso_unitary`)  $dualso(\text{unitaryso}(A))(X) = \text{unitaryso}(A^\dagger)(X)$
- (144) (`initialsoE`)  $\text{initialso}(|v\rangle)(X) = (\text{tr}X)|v\rangle\langle v|$
- (145) (`initialso_onb(CB)`)  $krausso(M, \lambda i. (K|i\rangle))(X) = \text{initialso}(K)(X)$
- (146) (`dualso_initialE`)  $dualso(\text{initialso}(|v\rangle))(X) = (\langle v|X|v\rangle)I$
- (147) (`dualso_comp`)  $dualso(\text{compso}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))(X) = \text{compso}(dualso(\mathcal{F}), dualso(\mathcal{E}))(X)$
- (148) (`dualso_compr`)  $dualso(\text{compsor}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}))(X) = \text{compsor}(dualso(\mathcal{F}), dualso(\mathcal{E}))(X)$
- (149) (`elemso_sum`)  $\text{sumso}(M, \lambda i. \text{elemso}(f, i))(X) = krausso(M, f)(X)$
- (150) (`ifso_elemE`)  $ifso(M, E, \mathcal{F})(X) = \sum_{i \in M} \text{compso}(\mathcal{F}_i, \text{elemso}(E, i))(X)$
- (151) (`ifso_elem`)  $ifso(M, E, \mathcal{F})(X) = \text{sumso}(M, \lambda i. (\text{compso}(\mathcal{F}_i, \text{elemso}(E, i))))(X)$
- (152) (`dualso_if`) **[FAIL]**  $dualso(\text{ifso}(M, E, \mathcal{F}))(X) = \sum_{i \in M} dualso(\text{compso}(\mathcal{F}_i, \text{elemso}(E, i)))(X)$
- (153) (`dualqmE`)  $\text{dualqm}(M, E, O) = \sum_{i \in M} dualso(\text{elemso}(E, i))(O_i)$
- (154) (`dualqm_trlfE`)  $\sum_{i \in M} \text{tr}(\text{elemso}(f, i)(X) \cdot O_i) = \text{tr}(X \cdot \text{dualqm}(M, f)(O))$
- (155) (`dualqm_trlfEV`)  $\sum_{i \in M} \text{tr}(O_i \cdot \text{elemso}(f, i)(X)) = \text{tr}(\text{dualqm}(M, f)(O) \cdot X)$
- (156) (`ifso_boolE`)  $ifso(\text{bool}, E, \mathcal{F})(X) = \text{compso}(\mathcal{F}_b, \text{elemso}(E, b))(X) + \text{compso}(\mathcal{F}_{-b}, \text{elemso}(E, -b))(X) \quad \text{for all } b \in \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$



- (157) (ifso\_bool)  $ifso(bool, E, \mathcal{F})(X) = addso(compso(\mathcal{F}_b, elemso(E, b)), compso(\mathcal{F}_{-b}, elemso(E, -b)))(X)$  for all  $b \in \{true, false\}$
- (158) (abortso\_eq0)  $abortso(X) = abortso(X)$
- (159) (formso\_comp)  $compso(formso(A_1), formso(A_2))(X) = formso(A_1 \cdot A_2)(X)$
- (160) (formlf\_soE)  $formlf(A, X) = formso(A)(X)$

----- Example of equations of linear operator with predicates -----

- (161) (hermlf\_normal)  $A$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow A$  is normal
- (162) (projlf\_herm)  $A$  is projection  $\rightarrow A$  is Hermitian
- (163) (projlf\_normal)  $A$  is projection  $\rightarrow A$  is normal
- (164) (isolf\_normal) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow A$  is normal
- (165) (isolf\_giso) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow A$  is bi-isometry
- (166) (gisolf\_iso)  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow A$  is isometry
- (167) (unitarylf\_iso)  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A$  is isometry
- (168) (unitarylf\_giso)  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A$  is bi-isometry
- (169) (isolf\_unitary) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow A$  is unitary
- (170) (gisolf\_unitary)  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow A$  is unitary
- (171) (is\_unitarylf)  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A$  is unitary
- (172) (isofK)  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow B \cdot A^\dagger \cdot A = B$
- (173) (isofE)  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow A^\dagger \cdot A = I$
- (174) (isofKE) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow A^\dagger(A|v\rangle) = |v\rangle$
- (175) (gisofKl)  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow B \cdot A^\dagger \cdot A = B$
- (176) (gisofKr)  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow B \cdot A \cdot A^\dagger = B$
- (177) (gisofEl)  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow A^\dagger \cdot A = I$
- (178) (gisofEr)  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow A \cdot A^\dagger = I$
- (179) (gisofKEl) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow A^\dagger(A|v\rangle) = |v\rangle$
- (180) (gisofKEr) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow A(A^\dagger|v\rangle) = |v\rangle$
- (181) (unitaryfKl)  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow B \cdot A^\dagger \cdot A = B$
- (182) (unitaryfKr)  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow B \cdot A \cdot A^\dagger = B$
- (183) (unitaryfEl) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A^\dagger \cdot A = I$
- (184) (unitaryfEr) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A \cdot A^\dagger = I$
- (185) (unitaryfKEl)  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A^\dagger(A|v\rangle) = |v\rangle$
- (186) (unitaryfKEr)  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A(A^\dagger|v\rangle) = |v\rangle$
- (187) (hermlf\_adjE)  $A$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow A^\dagger = A$
- (188) (hermf\_adjE)  $A$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow A^\dagger = A$
- (189) (projlf\_idem)  $A$  is projection  $\rightarrow A \cdot A = A$
- (190) (projf\_idem)  $A$  is projection  $\rightarrow A \cdot A = A$
- (191) (projlf\_idemE) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is projection  $\rightarrow A(A|v\rangle) = A|v\rangle$
- (192) (projf\_idemE) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is projection  $\rightarrow A(A|v\rangle) = A|v\rangle$
- (193) (hermlf\_dotE)  $A$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow (A|v\rangle)^\dagger|w\rangle = (|v\rangle)^\dagger(A|w\rangle)$
- (194) (hermf\_dotE)  $A$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow (A|v\rangle)^\dagger|w\rangle = (|v\rangle)^\dagger(A|w\rangle)$
- (195) (projlf\_dot) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is projection  $\rightarrow (|v\rangle)^\dagger(A|v\rangle) = (A|v\rangle)^\dagger(A|v\rangle)$
- (196) (projf\_dot) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is projection  $\rightarrow (|v\rangle)^\dagger(A|v\rangle) = (A|v\rangle)^\dagger(A|v\rangle)$
- (197) (projlf0)  $0$  is projection
- (198) (projlf1)  $I$  is projection
- (199) (unitarylf1)  $I$  is unitary
- (200) (normallfZ) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is normal  $\rightarrow cA$  is normal

- (201) (hermlfD)  $A$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow B$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow A + B$  is Hermitian  
(202) (isolf\_comp) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow B$  is isometry  $\rightarrow A \cdot B$  is isometry  
(203) (gisolf\_comp) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow B$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow A \cdot B$  is bi-isometry  
(204) (unitarylf\_comp) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow B$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A \cdot B$  is unitary  
(205) (normalf\_adj) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is normal  $\rightarrow A^\dagger$  is normal  
(206) (normalf\_tr) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is normal  $\rightarrow A^T$  is normal  
(207) (normalf\_conj) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is normal  $\rightarrow A^*$  is normal  
(208) (normalfZ) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is normal  $\rightarrow cA$  is normal  
(209) (normalfN) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is normal  $\rightarrow -A$  is normal  
(210) (hermf\_adj)  $A$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow A^\dagger$  is Hermitian  
(211) (hermf\_tr)  $A$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow A^T$  is Hermitian  
(212) (hermf\_conj)  $A$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow A^*$  is Hermitian  
(213) (hermfD)  $A$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow B$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow A + B$  is Hermitian  
(214) (hermfN)  $A$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow -A$  is Hermitian  
(215) (projf\_adj)  $A$  is projection  $\rightarrow A^\dagger$  is projection  
(216) (projf\_conj) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is projection  $\rightarrow A^*$  is projection  
(217) (projf\_tr) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is projection  $\rightarrow A^T$  is projection  
(218) (isof\_conj) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow A^*$  is isometry  
(219) (isof\_comp) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow B$  is isometry  $\rightarrow A \cdot B$  is isometry  
(220) (gisof\_adj) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow A^\dagger$  is bi-isometry  
(221) (gisof\_conj) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow A^*$  is bi-isometry  
(222) (gisof\_tr) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow A^T$  is bi-isometry  
(223) (gisof\_comp) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow B$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow A \cdot B$  is bi-isometry  
(224) (unitaryf\_comp) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow B$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A \cdot B$  is unitary  
(225) (unitaryf\_adj) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A^\dagger$  is unitary  
(226) (unitaryf\_conj) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A^*$  is unitary  
(227) (unitaryf\_tr) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A^T$  is unitary  
(228) (unitaryf\_form)  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A^\dagger \cdot A = I$   
(229) (unitaryf\_formV)  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A \cdot A^\dagger = I$   
(230) (isolf\_ns) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow A^*$  is isometry  
(231) (unitarymx\_tens) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow B$  is unitary  $\rightarrow A \otimes B$  is unitary  
(232) (isof\_dot) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow (A|v\rangle)^\dagger(A|v\rangle) = (|v\rangle)^\dagger(|v\rangle)$   
(233) (isofA\_dot) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow (A^\dagger|v\rangle)^\dagger(A^\dagger|v\rangle) = (|v\rangle)^\dagger(|v\rangle)$   
(234) (gisofA\_dot) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is bi-isometry  $\rightarrow (A^\dagger|v\rangle)^\dagger(A^\dagger|v\rangle) = (|v\rangle)^\dagger(|v\rangle)$   
(235) (unitary\_rowMcol) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is unitary  $\rightarrow (\langle i|A^\dagger)(A|i\rangle) = 1$   
(236) (qmeasure\_tpE)  $F$  is quantum measurement  $\rightarrow \sum_{i \in M} F_i^\dagger \cdot F_i = I$   
(237) (qm\_trlf) **[FAIL]**  $F$  is quantum measurement  $\rightarrow \sum_{i \in M} \text{tr}(F_i \cdot X \cdot F_i^\dagger) = \text{tr}(X)$   
(238) (elemso\_trlf) **[FAIL]**  $F$  is quantum measurement  $\rightarrow \sum_{i \in M} \text{tr}(\text{elemso}(F, i)(X)) = \text{tr}(X)$   
(239) (elem\_sum\_trlfE) **[FAIL]**  $F$  is quantum measurement  $\rightarrow \sum_{i \in M} \text{tr}(\text{elemso}(F, i)(X)) = \text{tr}(X)$   
(240) (cplmt\_proj) **[FAIL]**  $P$  is projection  $\rightarrow \text{cplmt}(P)$  is projection  
(241) (normalfE)  $A$  is normal  $\rightarrow A \cdot A^\dagger = A^\dagger \cdot A$   
(242) (formlf\_normal) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow B$  is normal  $\rightarrow \text{formlf}(A, B)$  is normal  
(243) (formlf\_herm)  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow B$  is Hermitian  $\rightarrow \text{formlf}(A, B)$  is Hermitian  
(244) (formlf\_proj) **[FAIL]**  $A$  is isometry  $\rightarrow B$  is projection  $\rightarrow \text{formlf}(A, B)$  is projection

----- Example from mxpred.v -----

- (245)  $\langle p|A|i\rangle\langle j|q\rangle = \delta_{j,q}\langle p|A|i\rangle$   
(246)  $\langle p|(|i\rangle\langle j|A)|q\rangle = \delta_{i,p}\langle j|A|q\rangle$   
(247)  $\langle i|M^*|j\rangle = \langle i|M|j\rangle^*$   
(248)  $\langle i|M^\dagger|j\rangle = \langle j|M|i\rangle^*$   
(249)  $(aA+B)^* = a^*A^* + B^*$   
(250)  $(A+B)^\dagger = A^\dagger + B^\dagger$   
(251)  $(cA)^\dagger = c^*A^\dagger$   
(252)  $(cA+B)^\dagger = c^*A^\dagger + B^\dagger$   
(253)  $(A \cdot B)^\dagger = B^\dagger \cdot A^\dagger$   
(254)  $(M^\dagger)^\dagger = M$   
(255)  $(aI)^\dagger = a^*I$   
(256)  $(1I)^\dagger = I$   
(257)  $(|i\rangle\langle j|)^* = |i\rangle\langle j|$   
(258)  $(|i\rangle\langle j|)^\dagger = |j\rangle\langle i|$   
(259)  $M^T = (M^*)^\dagger$   
(260)  $M^T = (M^\dagger)^*$   
(261)  $M^* = (M^\dagger)^T$   
(262)  $\text{tr}(M^\dagger) = \text{tr}(M)^*$   
(263)  $\text{tr}(M^*) = \text{tr}(M)^*$   
(264)  $(\langle i|M)^\dagger = M^\dagger|i\rangle$   
(265)  $(M|i)^\dagger = \langle i|M^\dagger$   
(266)  $\langle u|(\sum_i a_i|i\rangle\langle i|)|u\rangle = \sum_i a_i\langle u|i\rangle\langle i|u\rangle$   
(267)  $\langle i|(A \cdot B^\dagger)|j\rangle = \langle i|A(\langle j|B)^\dagger$   
(268)  $A \cdot B = \sum_i (A|i\rangle)(\langle i|B)$   
(269)  $\langle i|(\sum_{i \in U} d_i|i\rangle\langle i|)A = d_i\langle i|A$   
(270)  $\langle b| = \sum_{i \in U} (\langle b|i\rangle\langle i|)$   
(271)  $(A \cdot B)v = A(Bv)$   
(272)  $(A \cdot B) \cdot C = A \cdot (B \cdot C)$   
(273)  $A \cdot (aB + C) = a(A \cdot B) + (A \cdot C)$   
(274)  $(A_1 + A_2) \cdot B = A_1 \cdot B + A_2 \cdot B$   
(275)  $A \cdot (B_1 + B_2) = A \cdot B_1 + A \cdot B_2$   
(276)  $(-A) \cdot B = -(A \cdot B)$   
(277)  $A \cdot (-B) = -(A \cdot B)$   
(278)  $(kA) \cdot B = k(A \cdot B)$   
(279)  $A \cdot (kB) = k(A \cdot B)$   
(280)  $(kA_1 + A_2) \cdot B = k(A_1 \cdot B) + A_2 \cdot B$   
(281)  $A \cdot (kB_1 + B_2) = k(A \cdot B_1) + A \cdot B_2$   
(282)  $A \cdot B \cdot C \cdot D = A \cdot (B \cdot C) \cdot D$   
(283)  $A = \sum_{i \in U} \langle \text{fst } i|A|\text{snd } i\rangle|\text{fst } i\rangle\langle \text{snd } i|$

### H.3 Theories from Articles (Partial)

(1) (from [56])

$$(I \otimes P)C\left(\begin{bmatrix} u_0 & 0 \\ 0 & u_1 \end{bmatrix}\right) = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes P + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes P\left(\begin{bmatrix} u_0 & 0 \\ 0 & u_1 \end{bmatrix}\right),$$

where  $C(E) \triangleq |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes I + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes E$ .

(2) (from [72])

$$\text{tr}(P_n \rho) = \text{tr}(P \llbracket (\mathbf{while} \{M_0, M_1\} \mathbf{do} S \mathbf{end})^n \rrbracket (\rho)), \quad \text{where} \begin{cases} P_0 = \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}}}, \\ P_{n+1} = M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger (\text{wp}.S.P_n) M_1. \end{cases}$$